

VOLUME XXVIII

NUMBER 2

THE
HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

APRIL 1935

THE INTERNAL SENSES IN LATIN, ARABIC, AND HEBREW PHILO-
SOPHIC TEXTS *Harry Austryn Wolfson* 69

THE TEXT OF THE BIBLE AND THE SCRIPT AND ART OF TOURS
Leslie Webber Jones 135



CAMBRIDGE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1935

Issued Quarterly

\$3.00 a Year

Single Numbers \$1.00

THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Issued quarterly by the Faculty of Divinity in
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Editorial Committee

ARTHUR D. NOCK

WILLARD L. SPERRY
J. A. C. F. AUER

GEORGE LA PLANA
HENRY J. CADBURY

The *Harvard Theological Review* is maintained on the foundation established under the will of Mildred Everett, daughter of Charles Carroll Everett, Bussey Professor of Theology in Harvard University, 1869-1900, and Dean of the Faculty of Divinity, 1878-1900.

The scope of the Review embraces theology, ethics, the history and philosophy of religion, and cognate subjects. It aims to publish investigations, discussions, and reviews which contribute to the enlargement of knowledge or the advance of thought.

Remittances and communications on business matters should be addressed to the *Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts*.

PUBLISHED BY THE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHERS OF THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

*Entered as second-class mail matter January 2, 1903, at the post-office at Boston, Mass.
under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.*

*Acceptance for mailing at special postage rate provided for by Section 1103, Act of
October 3, 1917, authorized on July 31, 1918.*

THE INTERNAL SENSES
IN LATIN, ARABIC, AND HEBREW
PHILOSOPHIC TEXTS

HARRY AUSTRYN WOLFSON

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

CHAPTER I

Earliest use of the term "internal senses": Augustine, Gregory the Great, Erigena. — Two sets of threefold classifications of internal senses: (a) Hunain ben Iṣḥāk, Rāzī, Isaac Israeli, Pseudo-Baḥya; (b) Ibn Gabirol, Ibn Ezra, Maimonides. — Explanation of the origin of the unique fivefold classification of the Iḥwān al-Safā: analysis of the definition of *διανοητικόν* in John of Damascus. — Explanation of the baffling classification of the internal senses in the Syriac *Causa Causarum* and the Arabic *Sirr al-Ḥalīkah*.

IN ARISTOTLE there is no general term for those faculties of the soul which he treats of in the Third Book of *De Anima* and in *De Memoria et Reminiscentia* to differentiate them as a class from the five senses which he treats of in the Second Book of *De Anima*. In Latin, Arabic, and Hebrew philosophic texts, however, these post-sensational faculties, or some of them, or sometimes only one of them, are designated by the term "internal senses,"¹ in contradistinction to the five senses which are designated by the term "external senses."² Sometimes instead of "external" the terms "corporeal"³ and "passive"⁴ are used, and instead of "internal" the terms

¹ *sensus interiores* (or *interni*), حواس باطنة, פנימים, חושים, הרגשים, הרגשות (חושם, חושים, חושים, חושים, חושים). See below, nn. 10, 12, 25, 27, 64, 66, and cf. passages quoted in D. Kaufmann, *Die Sinne*, pp. 46-49.

² *extiores, extreni*, ظاهرة, חושים, חושים, חושים, חושים. See below, n. 27, and cf. Kaufmann, loc. cit.

³ *corporealis, corporeus*, جسماني, גופני, גופני, גופני, גופני. See below, nn. 27, 40, and Ch. II, n. 28, and cf. Kaufmann, loc. cit.

⁴ *operatae, patibiles*, מפעלות, انفعالات. Cf. below, n. 27.

"spiritual,"⁵ "separable,"⁶ and "cerebral."⁷ Sometimes, too, the term "faculties"⁸ or "apprehensions"⁹ is used instead of "senses." The use of the terms "internal," "spiritual," and "cerebral" has been explained by the fact that the faculties to which they are applied reside *within* the *brain* and operate *without* *bodily* organs.¹⁰ In histories of philosophy and psychology the entire subject of the internal senses is usually dismissed by a general statement to the effect that in post-Aristotelian philosophy three or five internal senses are contrasted with the five external senses. But the true history of the internal senses is more complicated than this, and the study of it involves problems in the interpretation of texts, the determination of the exact meaning of terms, and the analysis of certain functions of the soul. In this paper we shall try to trace the entire history of the problem, confining ourselves, however, to classification and terminology, and dealing with the interpretation of texts and the analysis and description of functions only in so far as they are necessary for the determination of the scheme of classification and the meaning of terms.¹¹

⁵ *spiritualis*, רוחני, נפשי, רוחני. See below, nn. 40, 64, and Ch. II, nn. 28, 73, and cf. Kaufmann, loc. cit.

⁶ *distinctus* (= *separabilis*), גבול, [מפרי], See below, Ch. II, n. 76.

⁷ *sensus cerebri*, *virtutes cerebri*. See below, nn. 10, 14.

⁸ *vis*, *virtus*, *potentia*, *facultas*, כח, פִּזְּוֹה. See below, nn. 10, 12.

⁹ *apprehensiones*, אִדְרָאק, השגחה. See below, n. 27.

¹⁰ Averroes, *Colliget*, II, 20, fol. 30 F (see below, Ch. II, n. 82): "Et virtutes cerebri . . . quamvis non habeant membra vel instrumenta, ipsa tamen habeant propria loca in cerebro." Keckermann (see below, Ch. III, n. 52), Cap. 17, Col. 1522: "Sensus interior est actio sensualis quae intus sit: sive, cuius causae instrumenta immediata sunt collocata intus, in ipso cerebro animalis." Magirus (see below, Ch. III, n. 53), p. 350: "Interiores, qui intra cranium subsistunt."

¹¹ Two more detailed treatments of the internal senses in the works of two philosophers dealt with here only in a general way will be found in my papers *Isaac Israeli on the Internal Senses*, in *George Alexander Kohut Memorial Volume* (1935), and *Maimonides on the Internal Senses*, in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, N. S., 25 (1935).

Important studies of the internal senses are to be found in the following works: S. Landauer, *Die Psychologie des Ibn Sînâ*, in *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 29 (1875), pp. 399 ff.; A. Schneider, *Die Psychologie Alberts des Grossen*, I (1903), pp. 154 ff.; S. Horowitz, *Die Psychologie des Aristotelikers Abraham Ibn Daud* (1912), in his *Die Psychologie bei den jüdischen Religions-Philosophen des Mittelalters von Saadia bis Maimuni* (1898-1912), pp. 238 ff.

When the term "internal sense" first appears in Latin philosophic texts it is used as synonymous with a single post-sensational faculty of the soul. In Augustine, who uses both "internal sense" (*interior sensus*) and "internal faculty" (*interior vis*),¹² these terms are employed as synonymous with Aristotle's "common sense" (*κοινὸν αἰσθητήριον*), for he invests these terms with some of the functions which in Aristotle are assigned to common sense.¹³ Similarly Gregory the Great's "sense of the brain" (*sensus cerebri*), which he describes as presiding within (*qui intrinsecus praesidet*), is also invested with one of the functions of Aristotle's "common sense," and is thus to be understood as a term synonymous with it.¹⁴ In Erigena the sense described as *interior* is identified with the Greek term *διάνοια*, which, according to his view, stands below *ratio* (*λόγος*) and *intellectus* (*νοῦς*) but above the five external senses and imagination.¹⁵

In Arabic and Hebrew philosophic literature, however, with one possible exception in the case of Arabic literature which we shall discuss later, the term "internal senses" appears from the very beginning as a generic term which includes a variety of post-sensational faculties. In its simplest form it is used to include three faculties: imagination (*φανταστικόν*), cogitation (*διανοητικόν*),¹⁶ and memory (*μνημονευτικόν*). Now these

¹² Confessiones, I, 20; *De Libero Arbitrio*, II, 3-5; Confessiones, VII, 17. I have been unable to find the use of "internal senses" prior to Augustine. Cicero's *tactus interior* (Acad., II, 7, 20) referred to by R. Eisler (Wörterbuch der philosophischen Begriffe, 4th ed., 1930, under "Wahrnehmung," p. 484) has an entirely different meaning. The statement by M. Dessoir in Abriss einer Geschichte der Psychologie (1911), p. 44, that "Galen unterschied sogar drei innere Sinne" is not quite correct. Galen himself does not use the term "internal sense," though Arabic philosophers in reproducing his classification of the post-sensational faculties describe them as internal senses. See below, nn. 18, 24.

¹³ Cf. The Confessions of Augustine, edited by J. Gibb and W. Montgomery (1908), notes ad loc. cit.

¹⁴ *Moralium Libri, sive Expositio in Librum Beati Job*, XI, 6 (Migne, LXXV, Col. 957 B). Cf. A. Schneider, *Die Erkenntnislehre bei Beginn der Scholastik* (1921), p. 32.

¹⁵ *De Divisione Naturae*, II, 23 (Migne, CXXII, Col. 577 D). Cf. A. Schneider, *Die Erkenntnislehre des Johannes Eriugena*, I (1921), 64.

¹⁶ Throughout mediaeval Latin texts, as will appear in the course of this paper, *cogitativa* is used as the equivalent of *διανοητική*. In Albertus Magnus, *Summa de*

three faculties are to be found in Aristotle's discussion of the faculties which are beyond sensation. Φανταστικόν is discussed by him in *De Anima*, III, 3. Διανοητικόν is the term which Aristotle himself, in his classification of the faculties of the soul in *De Anima*, II, 3, 414a, 32, applies to his discussion in *De Anima*, III, 4-6. Μνημονευτικόν is treated of by Aristotle in his *De Memoria et Reminiscentia*. We cannot, therefore, agree with the view that the threefold classification of internal senses is of Galenic origin or that there is something peculiarly Galenic in it.¹⁷ Galen's enumeration of these three post-sensatory faculties, precisely like his enumeration of the five senses which precedes it, is nothing but an analysis of Aristotle's *De Anima* and *De Memoria et Reminiscentia*, his enumeration of the five senses referring to *De Anima*, II, 5-12, and his enumeration of the post-sensatory faculties referring to *De Anima*, III, and *De Memoria et Reminiscentia* cited above. Like Aristotle, too, Galen does not use the term "internal senses" as a description of these post-sensatory faculties.¹⁸ The fact that Galen does not include in his list common sense, which is discussed by Aristotle in *De Anima*, III, 1-2, does not militate against our contention, for Aristotle himself, in his enumeration of the faculties of the soul in *De Anima*, II, 3, 414a, 32, and elsewhere, does not mention common sense, evidently for the reason that he would have included it among the five senses, of which it is the focal point, or else would have identified it with imagination, which is sometimes considered by him a function of common sense. Aristotle himself does not discuss this point, and there is reason to believe that the first two chapters of *De Anima*, III, which deal with common sense, should be annexed to *De Anima*, II,

Creaturis, II: *De Homine* (ed. Vivès), Quaest. 38, Art. 3, Solutio, *sylogistica* seems to be used as its equivalent: "Prima dicitur phantasia ab antiquioribus, secunda sylogistica, tertia memorialis."

¹⁷ Cf. S. Horovitz, *op. cit.*, pp. 238 ff., referring to Galen's *De Symptomatum Differentiis*, Cap. III, in *Opera Omnia* (ed. D. C. G. Kühn), VII, 56.

¹⁸ Cf. Index in *Galen Libros* in *Opera Omnia* (ed. D. C. G. Kühn), XX. Nor is "internal sense" used in the threefold classification of post-sensatory faculties by Nemesius, *De Natura Hominis*, Chs. 6, 12, 13, and by John of Damascus, *De Fide Orthodoxa*, II, 17, 19, 20.

which deals with the five senses.¹⁹ It is indeed true that Ḥunain and Razi, whom we shall soon cite, make mention of Galen in their threefold classifications of the post-sensatory faculties, but upon a close examination of their statements it will be discovered that their references to Galen are only in connection with the localization of these three faculties, in the anterior, middle, and posterior ventricles of the brain respectively,²⁰ rather than in connection with the enumeration of these faculties.

But the passages in Arabic and Hebrew literature which contain this threefold classification of the internal senses — and we shall refer to it as Galenic for the purpose of identification — do not seem to use the same type of classification, for they do not use the same terminology. On the whole, we may divide them into two groups. One group is represented by the lists given by Ḥunain ben Iṣḥāk,²¹ Razi,²² Isaac Israeli,²³ and Pseudo-Bahya.²⁴ In all of these lists the terms used are accurate translations of the three terms used by Galen, and in the case of Ḥunain and Razi explicit reference is made to him. The other group is represented by the lists given by Ibn Gabirol,²⁵ Abraham Ibn Ezra,²⁶ and Maimonides.²⁷ In these lists

¹⁹ Cf. R. D. Hicks, Aristotle: *De Anima*, p. 422, and below, Ch. III, n. 22.

²⁰ Cf. Galen, *De Locis Affectis*, III, 9, in *Opera Omnia* (ed. D. C. G. Kühn), VIII, 174 ff. This reference is given in P. de Koning, *Trois Traités d'Anatomie Arabes* (1903), p. 9, n. 2.

²¹ *Musere ha-Pilosofim*, II, 10 (Lunéville, 1807), p. 15a: (1) ציור, (2) מחשבה, (3) זכרון.

²² Cf. *Al-Manṣûri fi al-Tibb* in P. de Koning, *Trois Traités d'Anatomie Arabes* (1903), p. 9: (1) تخیل, (2) فکر, (3) ذکر.

²³ Hebrew: *Sefer ha-Yesodot*, II (ed. S. Fried), 53-55; Latin: *Liber de Elementis*, II, in *Omnia Opera Ysaaci*, Lyon, 1515, fol. ix, r:

(1) מצייר, *informatum*; אלפנטסיא, *phantasia*.

(2) מחשבי, *cogitatio*.

(3) זכרון, *memoria*.

²⁴ *Ma'ânî al-Nafs*, Ch. 8 (ed. I. Goldziher, 1907, p. 27, ll. 21-23): (1) خیال, (2) فکر, (3) ذکر.

²⁵ *Tikḥūn Middot ha-Nefesh* (Budapest, 1896), p. 11; Arabic: ed. S. S. Wise, *The Improvement of the Moral Qualities* (1902), p. 4, ll. 19-20: (1) فطرة, (2) فكرة, (3) محسبة. The term used here is "internal" (باطنة).

²⁶ *Commentary on Exodus* 31, 3: (1) תחיל, דעה, (2) فكرة, (3) חכמה, חכמה.

²⁷ *Moreh Nebukim*, I, 47 (46). Arabic: ed. S. Munk, *Guide des Égarés* (1856-66);

to sense-perception or imagination, but indirectly it belongs to thought (νοούμενον).²⁹ In an accidental sense (κατὰ συμβεβηκόσ), he also says, some of the things which are properly objects of scientific knowledge (ἐνία ὧν ἐπιστάμεθα) may be objects of memory; and of such intellectual objects of memory, he further states, a person is said to remember that he has learned something (ἐμαθεν) or contemplated something (ἐθεώρησεν).³⁰ Similarly, according to Plotinus, there are two kinds of memory: one is the memory of sense-objects (αἰσθητῶν), which belongs to imagination;³¹ the other is the memory of intellectual conceptions (νοητῶν, διανοήσεων), which belongs to reason (λόγος).³² John of Damascus, following Nemesius, distinguishes between these two kinds of memory and declares that intellectual conceptions (νοητά), being perceived only through learning (μάθησις) or through natural thinking (φυσικὴ ἔννοια), are also remembered through learning or natural thinking.³³ These two kinds of memory are also implied in Isaac Israeli's definitions of memory, where, like Aristotle and John of Damascus, he makes intellectual memory dependent upon investigation, i.e., learning, and contemplation.³⁴ Averroes, in his discussion of memory, explicitly says that "this faculty is in man by means of cogitation and deliberation."³⁵ Furthermore, recollection, as distinguished from memory, is according to Aristotle a sort of investigation

²⁹ De Memoria et Reminiscentia, I, 450a, 12-14.

³⁰ Ibid., 2, 451a, 28-29, and 1, 449b, 18-23.

³¹ Enneades, IV, iii, 29.

³² Ibid., 30.

³³ De Fide Orthodoxa, II, 20. Cf. Nemesius, De Natura Hominis, Ch. 13.

³⁴ Cf. Liber de Elementis, II, in Omnia Opera Ysaaci, Lyon, 1515, fol. ix, r, a; Hebrew: Sefer ha-Yesodot, II (ed. S. Fried), 55; Liber de Definitionibus, ibid., fol. iii, v, b; Arabic: ed. H. Hirschfeld, Jewish Quarterly Review, 15 (1902-03), p. 690; Hebrew: ed. H. Hirschfeld, Festschrift zum achzigsten Geburtstage Moritz Steinschneider's, 1896, Hebrew part, p. 139. Cf. my paper Isaac Israeli on the Internal Senses in George Alexander Kohut Memorial Volume. The terms used by Isaac Israeli are: (1) بحث, חקירה, *indagatio*, (2) نظر, דרישה, *inquisitio*.

³⁵ Epitome of De Memoria et Reminiscentia (see below, Ch. II, n. 75), fol. 21 G: "ista nam virtus est in homine per cognitionem." Instead of "*per cognitionem*" of the Latin translation the Arabic and Hebrew have: بفكر وروية, במחשבה והשתכלות = *per cogitationem et deliberationem*.

(ζήτησις) and syllogistic reasoning (συλλογισμός), and is therefore found only in man, who has the power of deliberation (βουλευτικός).³⁶ In view of all this, we may assume that in these three lists the third term means, or it originally meant, either memory of intellectual conceptions or recollection. The terms signifying "understanding" and "comprehension" used by Ibn Gabirol and Maimonides thus refer to the process of remembering intellectual conceptions, which according to Aristotle and John of Damascus is connected with learning, contemplation, and natural thinking, or else they refer to recollection, which according to Aristotle involves investigation, syllogistic reasoning, and deliberation. The term signifying "wisdom" used by Ibn Ezra refers to the intellectual conceptions themselves which form the contents of intellectual memory, or to the intellectual process involved in recollection, for in the passage referred to above he says: "And 'wisdom' refers to the forms [= intellectual forms] which are stored up in the posterior [ventricle] of the brain in the cranium." In another passage Ibn Ezra speaks definitely of recollection and says: "Know that in the posterior [ventricle] of the brain in the cranium is recollection, and that place is the storehouse of the forms, so that recollection includes memory."³⁷

Second, with regard to Ibn Gabirol's use of a term signifying "creation," "natural disposition," and "creative power" where we should expect him to use a term signifying "imagination," the substitution of terms can be explained by the description of imagination found in Maimonides, a similar description of which, we have reason to believe, must have also been known to Ibn Gabirol. In one place, Maimonides refers to imagination as a creation or natural disposition.³⁸ In another place he says that "every image in our imagination has been created."³⁹

³⁶ De Memoria et Reminiscentia, 2, 453a, 9-14.

³⁷ Commentary on Exodus 20, 1 ff.

³⁸ Moreh Nebukim, II, 36. The term used here for "creation" or "natural disposition" is *גמלה* (יצירה): *שלמות הכח המדמה בעקר היצירה*.

³⁹ Ibid., I, 46. The term for "created" used here is *מخلوقة* (ברואה) *כי כל צורה* *מדומה היא ברואה*.

In the threefold classifications we have so far studied there is no description of the functions of the various faculties which they mention. All we know about them is that they correspond to the three Greek terms *φαντασία*, *διάνοια*, and *μνήσις*, and that they are located in the anterior, middle, and posterior hollows of the brain respectively. But then we have a classification by the *Iḥwân al-Ṣafâ* which not only reproduces the same threefold classification, with the same localization, but adds to it two other faculties and includes also a description of the functions of each of these five faculties. The enumeration of these faculties, which the *Iḥwân al-Ṣafâ* designate "spiritual senses," in contradistinction to the five senses which they call "corporeal," together with the description of their functions, is as follows: (1) imagination, which (a) receives from sense-perception the impressions of the sensible objects and (b) assembles them; (2) cogitation, which distinguishes these impressions one from another and knows the true from the false, the right from the wrong, and the useful from the harmful; (3) memory, which preserves these judgments of the cogitative faculty until the time of need and recollection; (4) speaking faculty, the seat of which is in the throat and tongue and the function of which is to communicate the contents of one's mind to others; (5) productive faculty, the seat of which is in the hands and fingers and by means of which the soul produces the art of writing as well as all the other arts.⁴⁰

Now, of these five internal senses the first three are in terminology and localization identical with the threefold classifications we have dealt with before. The description of these three internal senses which is added in this list can be traced to Aristotle. The description of imagination can be easily recognized as being made up of Aristotle's description of imagination and his description of one of the functions of common sense. Thus the first part of the description given by the *Iḥwân al-Ṣafâ* of imagination, namely, that which retains the

⁴⁰ Cf. Fr. Dieterici, Arabic text: *Die Abhandlungen der Ichwân Es-Safâ in Auswahl*, pp. 468 ff., 209 ff., 220; German translation: *Die Anthropologie der Araber*, pp. 56 and 38; *Die Lehre der Weltseele bei den Arabern*, pp. 46-47. The terms used are as follows: (1) متخيلة, (2) مفكرة, (3) حافظة, (4) ناطقة, (5) صانعة.

impressions of sense-perception, reflects Aristotle's statements that "sensations and images remain in the sense-organs even when the sensible objects are withdrawn"⁴¹ and that "imagination remains in us and resemble corresponding sensations."⁴² The second part of their description of imagination, namely, that which assembles all the impressions of the various senses, reflects again Aristotle's description of one of the functions of common sense as that which correlates the various impressions of the senses and forms out of them a unified percept.⁴³ Similarly their description of cogitation can be traced to Aristotle's description of the cogitative soul (*διανοητική ψύχη*) as the faculty which judges what is good and what is evil, what is to be pursued and what is to be avoided,⁴⁴ and also to his description of *διάνοια* as containing the functions of combination and separation,⁴⁵ that is to say, of the cognition of what is true and false.⁴⁶ Furthermore, their use of the term "distinguishes"⁴⁷ in connection with the cognition of truth and falsehood reflects Aristotle's use of *κρίνειν* in connection with the cognition of truth and falsehood.⁴⁸ Finally, their definition of memory is analogous to what, as we have shown, Aristotle and others have called intellectual memory, as distinguished from sensitive memory, the latter being a function of imagination. But how did the Iḥwân al-Şafâ happen to add the other two unprecedented internal senses to these original three?

I wish to make two suggestions with regard to the question.

My first suggestion is that the fivefold classification of internal senses by the Iḥwân al-Şafâ is the result of a combination of two threefold classifications, the Galenic and the Stoic, the second of the three terms being the same in both classifications. The Galenic classification has already been reproduced

⁴¹ De Anima, III, 2, 425b, 24-25.

⁴² Ibid., III, 3, 429a, 4-5.

⁴³ De Sensu et Sensibili, 7, 449a, 3-10.

⁴⁴ De Anima, III, 7, 431a, 14-17.

⁴⁵ Metaphysics, VI, 1027b, 29-30.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 25-27.

⁴⁷ *يُمَيِّزُ*.

⁴⁸ De Anima, III, 3, 428a, 2-3.

before. The Stoic classification is as follows: *φωνητικόν, δια-
νοητικόν, γεννητικόν*.⁴⁹ Now, the fourth term in the Iḥwân al-
Ṣafâ's list, "speaking" (*nâṭikah*), is a literal translation of the
first term in the Stoic list, *φωνητικόν*. As for the fifth term in
their list, "productive" (*ṣâni'ah*), it may be taken to represent
the third term in the Stoic list, if we assume that that term,
γεννητικόν, which means "productive" in the sense of begetting
children, was in its transmission into Arabic taken to mean
"productive" in the general sense.

My second suggestion rests on the assumption that the classi-
fication of the Iḥwân al-Ṣafâ originated in a list of five terms
in which the *fourth* term meant what Aristotle calls "theoreti-
cal science" (*ἐπιστήμη θεωρητική*) and the *fifth* term meant
what he calls "practical" (*πρακτική*) and "productive" (*ποιη-
τική*) sciences. In that original list, I then secondly assume that
the *fourth* and *fifth* faculties, which are additional to the origi-
nal Galenic three, were derived from a current description of
the functions of Galen's second faculty, *διανοητική*. Thirdly,
I also assume that the descriptions of the functions of the
fourth and *fifth* terms in the list of the Iḥwân al-Ṣafâ were added
to the original list as a result of a misunderstanding of the
meaning of these terms in the original list.

Let me now explain these three points.

(a) The fourth term (*nâṭikah*) in the Iḥwân al-Ṣafâ is tech-
nically the equivalent of the Greek *λογική* or *λογιστική*. Now,
λογιστική is sometimes used by Aristotle as the equivalent of
θεωρητική (cf. *De Anima*, III, 9, 432b, 26-27), for which the
Arabic is *nazarîyyah*⁵⁰ or *'ilmîyyah*.⁵¹ It is quite reasonable to
assume that a similar interchange of terms took place also in
Arabic, and therefore the Iḥwân al-Ṣafâ's *nâṭikah* really means
"theoretical" and not merely "rational." Again, as I have

⁴⁹ Diogenes Laertius, *De Vitis*, VII, 110. In other sources for *γεννητικόν* the term
σπερματικόν is used. Cf. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, p. 390. But for our purpose here
the assumption of the use of the term *γεννητικόν* is necessary.

⁵⁰ نظري. Cf. Averroes, *Compendio de Metafisica* (ed. Carlos Quirós Rodríguez,
Madrid, 1919), § 2, Arabic text, p. 1.

⁵¹ علمية. Cf. my *The Classification of Sciences in Mediaeval Jewish Philosophy* in
Hebrew Union College Jubilee Volume (1925), p. 265.

shown elsewhere,⁵² in the Iḥwân al-Şafâ the Aristotelian distinction between theoretical and practical has disappeared and in its place there is only the distinction between theoretical and productive, the Aristotelian practical sciences having been placed by them under theology. While elsewhere for "productive" the Iḥwân al-Şafâ use the term '*amaliyyah*,'⁵³ the term *şâni'ah* used by them here may have the same meaning, especially when contrasted with *nâtîkah*.

(b) Now, theoretical, practical, and productive sciences are found to have been included among the functions of Galen's *διανοητικόν*, in a work of a man who was influential in the early history of Arabic philosophy. I refer to John of Damascus. He says: "To *διανοητικόν* belong [1] judgments (*κρίσεις*), assents (*συγκαταθέσεις*), impetuses (*ὀρμαί*) toward acting, and aversions (*ἀφορμαί*) toward, and avoidances of, action; [2] and especially considerations with regard to intellectual notions; and [3] virtues, and sciences, principles of arts, deliberation, and choice."⁵⁴

I have purposely inserted numbers in the translation of the passage quoted in order to indicate the three distinct sets of functions which are ascribed in it to *διανοητικόν*.

The first set of functions of *διανοητικόν* mentioned here by John of Damascus reflects Aristotle's statements we have quoted above to the effect that *διάνοια* is the faculty which judges what is true or false, what is good or evil, and decides what is to be pursued or avoided.⁵⁵ The terms *συγκαταθέσεις*, *ὀρμαί*, and *ἀφορμαί* used in this passage show the additional influence of the Stoics. The term *κρίσεις* used here by John of Damascus and the term *tamayyaza* used by the Iḥwân al-Şafâ in the description of cognition show a dependence on a common source. Both of them go back to Aristotle's statement that the knowledge of truth and falsehood involves a judgment and is a sort of combination and separation.⁵⁶

⁵² Cf. *ibid.*, p. 266.

⁵³ *آمالية*. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 265.

⁵⁴ De Fide Orthodoxa, II, 19.

⁵⁵ Cf. above, nn. 44, 46. Cf. also below on Isaac Israeli, n. 74.

⁵⁶ Cf. above, nn. 45, 48.

The second and third sets of functions mentioned by John of Damascus under *διανοητικόν* can be shown to be an elaboration of Aristotle's general statement that "all thought (*διάνοια*) is either practical or productive or theoretical,"⁵⁷ for when we closely examine the terms used by John of Damascus we find that they all fall under the three types of thought, or rather the three classes of science, enumerated by Aristotle. Thus, for instance, the knowledge of intellectual notions, which John of Damascus mentions in the second set of functions, corresponds to Aristotle's definition of metaphysics,⁵⁸ which is one of his three theoretical sciences. Thus also the terms "virtues" and "deliberation and choice," used in the third set of functions, are borrowed from ethics,⁵⁹ which is one of the three Aristotelian practical sciences. Similarly, the terms "sciences" and "arts," mentioned again in the third set of functions, suggest what Aristotle calls productive sciences.⁶⁰

In view of all this, we may assume that the Iḥwân al-Şafâ had before them a fivefold classification of the internal senses, containing: (1) imagination, (2) cogitation, (3) memory, (4) *nâṭikah*, and (5) *şâni'ah*. The first three terms in that list contained also a description of their function, and the description of the third term, "cogitation," corresponded to the description by John of Damascus of the first set of functions of *διανοητικόν*. The last two terms contained no description, but they were meant to refer respectively to (1) theoretical science and (2) practical and productive sciences, corresponding to the second and third sets of functions of *διανοητικόν* in John of Damascus' description.

(c) We now come to the third and last step in our argument. The fourth term, *nâṭikah*, in the list before the Iḥwân al-Şafâ, while technically meaning "rational" and hence "theoretical," comes from a word which like the Greek *λόγος* literally means "speech." Not having before them any description of that

⁵⁷ Metaphysics, VI, 1, 1025b, 25.

⁵⁸ Ibid., VI, 1, 1026a, 10-11; cf. De Anima, I, 1, 403b, 15-16.

⁵⁹ Cf. terms *ἀρετή*, *βούλευσις*, *προαίρεσις* in Nicomachean Ethics, *passim*.

⁶⁰ Cf. terms *ἐπιστήμη*, *τέχνη* in Metaphysics, I, 1, 981a, 2.

term, the *Iḥwân al-Şafâ*, or somebody else before them, took it in its literal sense and described it as the faculty of speech, the seat of which is in the tongue and the throat. In taking the term *nâtîkah* in its literal sense of speech, they were perhaps supported by some such passage as that in John of Damascus in which τὸ λογικόν, i.e., the Greek equivalent of the Arabic *nâtîkah*, is said to be divided into internal (ἐνδιάθετον) and expressed (προφορικόν) speech.⁶¹ Similarly with regard to the fifth term, *şâni'ah*, not having before them any description of its functions, they took it in its obvious sense of productive art and described it as the power which produces the art of writing as well as the other arts, and the seat of which is in the hands and fingers.

This analysis of διανοητικόν, together with the fact, which we have mentioned above,⁶² that Erigena identified the term "internal sense" with διάνοια, will throw light upon two puzzling classifications of the internal senses which scholars have found difficult to explain. One is found in a Syriac work known as *Causa Causarum*.⁶³ Using the terms "spiritual" and "internal,"⁶⁴ the author of that work enumerates five senses, which are listed here in the transliterated form of the original terms together with their German equivalents as given by the editor and translator of the text: (1) *hauna*, Vernunft, (2) *mada'a*, Verstand, (3) *sukala*, Erkenntniss, (4) *buyuna*, Einsicht, (5) *parushuta* or *hushba*, Unterscheidung.⁶⁵ The other is found in an Arabic work, entitled *Sirr al-Ḥalîkah*, which is attributed to Apollonius of Tyana.⁶⁶ Using the term

⁶¹ De Fide Orthodoxa, II, 21.

⁶² Cf. above, n. 15.

⁶³ Cf. Karl Kayser, Das Buch von der Erkenntniss der Wahrheit oder der Ursache aller Ursachen, Syriac text (1889), p. 27, l. 17; p. 125, l. 12; p. 126, l. 16; German translation (1893), pp. 35, 160, 162.

⁶⁴ ܠܠܚܢܐ ܕܠܠܚܢܐ (p. 125, l. 12; p. 126, l. 16), ܠܠܚܢܐ ܕܠܠܚܢܐ (p. 27, l. 17). For "external senses" the term used is ܠܠܚܢܐ ܕܠܠܚܢܐ (p. 27, l. 15).

⁶⁵ (1) ܠܠܚܢܐ, (2) ܠܠܚܢܐ, (3) ܠܠܚܢܐ, (4) ܠܠܚܢܐ, (5) ܠܠܚܢܐ (p. 125, l. 12) or ܠܠܚܢܐ (p. 27, l. 17).

⁶⁶ Cf. A. J. Sylvestre de Sacy, Le Livre du Secret de la Créature in Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale, IV (1789), 116.

"internal senses," the author enumerates five senses, which are listed here together with their French equivalents as given by the translator of the text: (1) *fikrah*, pensée, (2) *fitnah*, réflexion, (3) *diká'*, intelligence, (4) *himmah*, esprit, (5) *niyah*, jugement.⁶⁷ Now these two classifications have proved rather baffling,⁶⁸ for while some of the terms contained in them may be made to mean some of those faculties which are conventionally understood by internal senses, they do not on the whole correspond to any of the conventional fivefold classifications of the internal senses which we shall discuss later. But I shall try to show that this difficulty can be removed if we take the term "internal" or "spiritual" senses in these two texts not in its usual meaning but rather in the meaning in which it is taken by Erigena, namely, as identical with *διάνοια*.

In our analysis of the definition of *διανοητικόν* by John of Damascus we have already seen how in one set of terms he virtually reproduces Aristotle's description of *διάνοια* as the function of combination and separation⁶⁹ and of the distinction⁷⁰ between good and evil⁷¹ and between true and false.⁷² More compactly, and evidently following the same passages of Aristotle, Isaac Israeli similarly attributes to the "cogitative faculty," i.e., the *διανοητικόν*, the functions of perscrutation, discernment, and combination,⁷³ and in another place he attributes to that faculty a somewhat amplified list, containing the following functions: (1) interpretation and discretion, (2) perscrutation, (3) separation and combination, and (4) the knowledge of things according to their truth.⁷⁴ All these terms, as will have been noticed, are of the same nature as

⁶⁷ (1) فِكْرَة, (2) فِطْنَة, (3) ذِكَا', (4) هِمَّة, (5) نِيَّة.

⁶⁸ Cf. A. J. Sylvestre de Sacy, loc. cit., n. m, and S. Horowitz, op. cit., p. 257, n. 106; p. 258, n. 107.

⁶⁹ Cf. above, n. 45.

⁷⁰ Cf. above, nn. 47, 48.

⁷¹ Cf. above, n. 44.

⁷² Cf. above, n. 46.

⁷³ Liber de Elementis, II, fol. ix, r, a: "cogitationis enim est perscrutari et discernere et componere." Sefer ha-Yesodot, II, 55: לפי שיש לכה המחשבי כח החקירה וההבדל ו[ה]חבור.

⁷⁴ Liber de Elementis, III, fol. x, r, a: "intellectualis sensus: qui est (1) interpretatio et discretio, (2) et perscrutatio, (3) et solutio et ligatio, (4) et cognitio rerum

those found in Aristotle and John of Damascus. Now, the five Syriac terms used in the *Causa Causarum* and the five Arabic terms used in *Sirr al-Ḥalīkah*, with all their vagueness, do on the whole describe certain functions of thought, and with a little effort one could perhaps conjecturally show that they possess some specific meaning, corresponding to the terms used by Aristotle, John of Damascus, and Isaac Israeli in the description of *διάνοια*. Furthermore, in a work which is extant in Hebrew and conjecturally attributed to Isaac Israeli, reason, by which is meant cogitation, is said to contain the following five functions: (1) *hokmah*, wisdom, (2) *binah*, understanding, (3) *hakkarah*, discrimination, (4) *yedi'ah*, knowledge, (5) *tub ha-maḥashabah*, good thinking.⁷⁵ In this passage, it will be noticed, the five terms correspond almost exactly to the five terms in the Syriac and Arabic passages, three of them being of the same root as the Syriac terms.

That the term "spiritual" or "internal" senses used in *Causa Causarum* means the thinking faculty can be shown by a study of the context in which it occurs. The author of the work contrasts two views with regard to the constituent faculties of the human soul. According to some philosophers, he says, the rational soul⁷⁶ has three faculties,⁷⁷ namely, (1) knowing⁷⁸ or thinking⁷⁹ faculty, which is rationality⁸⁰ itself, (2) an-

secundum veritate." Sefer ha-Yesodot, III, 68: חוש השכלי אשר הוא (1) ההכרה, (2) והחקירה, (3) וההתר והקשור, (4) והעמידה [= וההתבוננות] על אמת הענינים.

By "intellectualis sensus" Isaac Israeli means here *διάνοια*. The combination of the terms "intellectualis" and "sensus" can be explained on the ground of Aristotle's own use of the term *αἰσθησις* in the sense of *νοῦς* in Nicomachean Ethics, VI, 11, 143b, 5. The terms "interpretatio," "discretio," "perscrutatio," "investigatio," and their Arabic and Hebrew equivalents I have shown to reflect the Greek *κρίσις*. Cf. my paper Isaac Israeli on the Internal Senses in op. cit.

⁷⁶ Sefer ha-Ruah weha-Nefesh le-Rabbi Isaac ha-Yisraeli, ed. M. Steischneider, in *Ha-Karmel*, I (1871-72), 202: ואם אמרו חכמה ובינה והכרה ויריעה וטוב המחשבה הנה כל זה מכח השכל. For the use of the term שכל in the sense of *cogitatio*, see above, n. 74.

⁷⁶ ܡܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܢܬܐ (p. 125, l. 8) = λογιστική.

⁷⁷ ܕܢܐܡܐ (l. 7) = δύναμις.

⁷⁸ ܕܡܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܢܬܐ (l. 8) = νόσις.

⁷⁹ ܕܡܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܢܬܐ (l. 8) = διανόσις.

⁸⁰ ܕܡܠܟܬܐ ܕܡܢܬܐ (l. 8) = λόγος.

ger,⁸¹ and (3) desire.⁸² According to other philosophers, whom the anonymous author himself follows, it has only two faculties, (1) animal faculty⁸³ and (2) rational faculty,⁸⁴ the latter of which is subdivided into five spiritual⁸⁵ or internal⁸⁶ senses. Now, it is quite evident that the three faculties which he enumerates first correspond to the Platonic tripartite division of the soul: (1) the rational (λογιστικόν), (2) the irascible (θυμοειδές), (3) the concupiscent (ἐπιθυμητικόν).⁸⁷ It is also quite evident that his subsequent reduction of the irascible and concupiscent faculties to one animal faculty reflects two statements of Aristotle, first, that concupiscence (ἐπιθυμία) and irascibility (θυμός) are included under appetency (ὄρεξις) and hence under sensation (αἴσθησις),⁸⁸ and, second, that it is sensation primarily which constitutes the animal (ζῶον).⁸⁹ But inasmuch as his five spiritual or internal senses are subdivisions of what he calls the knowing or thinking or rational faculty, they cannot of necessity be what is conventionally understood by "internal senses," for the latter, as we have already seen, generally include imagination and memory and sometimes also, as we shall see later, common sense. But neither imagination nor common sense belongs to the knowing, thinking, or rational faculty of the soul, and as for memory, it belongs only accidentally, as we have seen above, to the rational faculty; primarily it belongs to the sensible faculty. It is therefore clear that these internal senses of the Causa Causarum belong, as we have set out to show, to the διανοητικόν, so that the term "internal sense" is used there in the same sense as in Erigena.

⁸¹ 𐌲𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌹 (l. 9) = θυμός.

⁸² 𐌲𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌹 (l. 10) = ἐπιθυμία.

⁸³ 𐌲𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌹 (l. 10) = ζῶος.

⁸⁴ 𐌲𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌹 (l. 10) = λογιστικός.

⁸⁵ Cf. above, n. 64.

⁸⁶ Cf. above, n. 64.

⁸⁷ Cf. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, II, 1 (5th edition, 1922), pp. 844-845.

⁸⁸ *De Anima*, II, 3, 414b, 1-2.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 2, 413b, 2.

CHAPTER II

Tracing the origin of the *virtus aestimativa* (Arabic: *wahm*) to Aristotle. — How the introduction of *virtus aestimativa* has brought about other changes in the classification of the internal senses: two kinds of composite imagination. — The *virtus aestimativa* in Alfarabi: his fourfold classification. — The introduction of "common sense": the seven internal faculties. — Avicenna's various fivefold classifications. — Algazali's classifications. — Damiri. — Judah ha-Levi, Bahya ibn Paqudah, and Abraham ibn Daud. — Averroes' departure from Avicenna: his fourfold and threefold classifications. — The case of Maimonides. — Post-Maimonidean Hebrew philosophic texts: Joseph Zabara, Zohar, Shem-Tob Falaquera, Ruah Hen, Gershon ben Solomon, Meir Aldabi, Hillel of Verona.

THE history of the classification of the internal senses, it is said,¹ consists in the rise of the original three Galenic faculties to five by the addition of "common sense" and of what the scholastics call *aestimatio*. This is only partly correct, for, as we have already seen, there was the fivefold classification of the Iḥwân al-Şafâ which arose either from the combination of the Galenic and the Stoic threefold classifications or from the breaking up of the Galenic, or rather Aristotelian, διανοητικόν into its constituent elements. Then, also, we shall show that prior to the rise of the original three to five by the addition of "common sense" and "estimation" there was a fourfold classification which arose by the addition of "estimation" only. Incidentally we shall also show that the generally accepted explanation of the origin of the estimative faculty is to be discarded, and a new explanation will be offered. Furthermore, we intend to show how the addition of estimation to the original threefold classification of the internal senses has completely changed the meaning of the Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin terms which represented originally the Greek διανοητικόν, and how it has also introduced a new distinction in the terms representing the Greek φαντασία. Still further, we shall show how with the introduction of "common sense" and "estimation" the original three internal senses rose not to five but to seven, and how these seven were variously combined by different authors and sometimes even by one and the

¹ Cf. S. Horovitz, *op. cit.*, pp. 240-242.

same author to yield a fivefold classification. In connection with this we shall also endeavor to determine the exact meaning of Averroes' views on the internal senses and the scheme of his two classifications. Finally, when we come to deal again with Latin texts we shall show how these various classifications in Arabic literature have given rise to a further development which continued until the time of Kant.

But let us begin our history of the subsequent development of the classification of the internal senses by a discussion of that faculty which in Arabic is known as *wahm* and in scholastic philosophy is known as *aestimatio* or *vis aestimativa*. By definition, estimation is that faculty by which animals instinctively pursue certain things and avoid others — as, for instance, the instinctive action of a lamb in running to another lamb, even if it has never seen it before, and similarly its instinctive action in fleeing from a wolf, even if it has never seen one before. In Aristotle no mention is made of a faculty known as "estimation," but scholars have tried to identify it with what Aristotle calls *δόξα*.² When an objection was raised against this identification on the ground of the fact that the characteristic distinction of the estimative faculty as the equivalent in animals of reason in man does not correspond to *δόξα*, which according to Aristotle does not exist in animals,³ reference was made to Porphyry, who reports that according to some philosophers *δοξαστικόν* is connected with sensation and imagination.⁴ The conclusion to be drawn from this reference was that those who connected *δοξαστικόν* with sensation and imagination would of necessity also attribute it to animals as one of their faculties. This conclusion, however, does not

² Cf. A. Schmoelders, *Documenta Philosophiae Arabum* (1836), pp. 116–118; S. Landauer, *Die Psychologie des Ibn Sînâ in Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 29 (1875), p. 401, n. 6; S. Horovitz, *op. cit.*, pp. 250–251, n. 93. But this connection between *aestimatio* and *δόξα* has already been discussed by Albertus Magnus, *Liber de Apprehensione*, Pars III, § 11: "*Discipulus*. Similitudinem etiam cum opinione habere videtur. *Philosophia* . . . et ideo quidam ex alumnis meis hanc virtutem [= *aestimativam*] credebant opinionem esse." *Opinio* = *δόξα*. Cf. also D. B. Macdonald, *Wahm in Arabic and its Cognates in The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1922), pp. 505–521.

³ *De Anima*, III, 3, 428a, 19–22.

⁴ Cf. Stobaeus, *Eclogae* (ed. Wachsmuth), Vol. I, p. 348, and cf. Landauer, *loc. cit.*

seem to me necessarily to follow from the premise. The mere statement that *δοξαστικόν* is connected with sensation and imagination does not necessarily mean that it must be possessed by animals; it may only mean that wherever *δοξαστικόν* exists, that is, in man, it is connected with sensation and imagination. Still less does it explain how the estimative faculty, if it represents Aristotle's *δόξα* as modified and extended to animals by the philosophers quoted by Porphyry, came to be used primarily as a function peculiar to animals. At best it could only explain why it should be applied also to animals; it does not explain why it should apply primarily to animals. Furthermore, the characteristic description of the estimative faculty as that of the instinctive fears and likes of animals does not correspond to the characteristic descriptions of *δόξα* which we find in Aristotle.⁵

Another alleged link connecting the estimative faculty with Aristotle's *δόξα* was discovered in a passage by Philoponus in his commentary on *De Anima*. Taking up Aristotle's statement that neither *δόξα* nor *πίστις* is to be found in animals, Philoponus raises an objection against it on the ground of the fact that horses have an instinctive fear of the lash. In answer to this objection, he says that this instinctive fear of the horse is not due to conviction (*πειθόν*) but rather to habit (*ἔθισμόν*).⁶ But this passage, which is taken to establish a link between the estimative faculty and *δόξα*, seems to me to prove on the contrary that there is no connection between them, since *δόξα* is explicitly said by Aristotle to be connected with *πίστις*, whereas the animal faculty under consideration is explicitly said by Philoponus to have no connection with *πίστις*. Nor can we infer from this passage that *wahm*, or the estimative faculty, is connected in some way with the Greek *ἔθισμόν*, for there is no etymological connection between these terms. We must therefore look to some other source in Aristotle to account for the rise of the estimative faculty.

⁵ On the functions of *δόξα*, cf. J. Geyser, *Die Erkenntnistheorie des Aristoteles*, pp. 181 ff.

⁶ Cf. Ioannis Philoponi Aristotelis de Animae Libros Commentaria (ed. M. Hayduck), p. 500, ll. 25 ff., and cf. S. Horowitz, *op. cit.*, pp. 250-251, n. 93.

I am going to show that such a source can be found.

The need of introducing *wahm*, or the estimative faculty, as a new faculty arose, it seems to me, out of a desire to supplement a deficiency which seemed to exist in Aristotle's account of the actual motion of pursuit and avoidance which is observed in both man and animals. While pure judgment of what is to be pursued or avoided is attributed by Aristotle to the cogitative soul (*ψυχὴ διανοητική*), actual pursuit or avoidance, according to him, is determined by the combined action of the appetitive faculty (*ὀρεκτικόν*) and imagination (*φαντασία*).⁷ Now, imagination is possessed by both man and animal, but in man it may be rational (*λογιστική*) or deliberative (*βουλευτική*), whereas in animals it is only sensitive (*αἰσθητική*). The difference between the motions of pursuit and avoidance caused by these two kinds of imagination, as may be gathered from Aristotle, is as follows: the motion caused by sensitive imagination is a pursuit and avoidance of something that directly causes pleasure and pain, whereas that caused by rational and deliberative imagination may be a pursuit and avoidance of something that may remotely or indirectly cause pleasure and pain, or what Aristotle calls good and evil.⁸ Now this explanation of the motion of animals would have been sufficient if animals pursued only that which is directly good and avoided that which is directly bad. But this is contrary to fact. Animal life shows a kind of planning for the attainment of remote pleasure and for the avoidance of remote pain. Aristotle himself describes such a kind of behavior on the part of animals in his *Historia Animalium*, VIII-IX. Now, sensitive imagination could not accomplish that, for by definition, as we have seen, it can produce only pursuit and avoidance of direct pleasure and pain. It would therefore be necessary to introduce another faculty which would act upon the imagination of animals as the rational or deliberative faculty acts upon the imagination of man.

The suggestion that such a faculty exists in animals is made by Aristotle himself. In one place he says that comparable

⁷ *De Anima*, III, 7, 431a, 14-17, and III, 10, 433b, 27-30.

⁸ *Ibid.*, III, 7, 431a, 8-20; III, 10, 433b, 27-11, 434a, 10.

to intelligence (διάνοια) in man there is in animals something equivalent to sagacity (σύνεσις)⁹ or a natural faculty (φυσική δύναμις) equivalent to art (τέχνη), wisdom (σοφία), and sagacity (σύνεσις).¹⁰ In another place he describes animals as prudent (φρόνιμος)¹¹ or as sagacious (συνετός).¹² In still another place he speaks of animals as having a faculty of forethought (προνοητική δύναμις).¹³ Now, this faculty of sagacity, prudence, or forethought, which Aristotle attributes to animals as corresponding to intellect in man, accurately corresponds to the description of the Arabic *wahm* and scholastic *aestimatio*. The common element which appears in the description of *wahm* or *aestimatio* in Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin writings is the fact of its being the faculty whereby an animal, without previous experience, perceives the insensible forms connected with the impression of sensible objects, such as the sheep's instinctive perception of hostility and fear at the sight of a wolf or its instinctive perception of friendliness and love at the sight of its young ones. Furthermore, when estimation in animals is combined with imagination it becomes a faculty by which animals are enabled to perform work which in the case of men is ascribed to art and intelligence. Abraham ibn Daud illustrates this by the example of the cochineal insect making almond-shaped structures and of the bee making honeycombs.¹⁴ Similarly in Aristotle the swallow is said to make its nest and the spider its web neither by art (τέχνη), nor after inquiry (ζητήσαντα) or deliberation (βουλευσάμενα), nor by intelligence (νῶ), but by nature (φύσει).¹⁵ That animal action which Aristotle attributes to "nature" is the same as what is later described as "estimation" is evident from Averroes' statement that what he, evidently following Aristotle,

⁹ *Historia Animalium*, VIII, 1, 588a, 23.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 29-31.

¹¹ *De Partibus Animalium*, II, 2, 648a, 5-8.

¹² *Ibid.*, II, 4, 650b, 24.

¹³ *Nicomachean Ethics*, VI, 7, 1141a, 28.

¹⁴ *Emunah Ramah*, I, 6, p. 29.

¹⁵ *Physics*, II, 8, 199a, 20-30. This Aristotelian view recurs in the writings of the Stoics, Philo, and Cicero. Cf. I. Heinemann, *Poseidonios' metaphysische Schriften*, II, 464-465.

describes in animals as the work of "nature" is described by Avicenna as "estimation" (cf. below, nn. 79, 80). What happened then is really this: The "natural faculty" with which animals were endowed according to Aristotle was split up into two faculties, one becoming pure estimation and the other becoming estimation combined with imagination. But while estimation exists primarily in animals, taking in them the place of reason in man, it is said to exist also in man and to be often used by man in many of his judgments which are not affected directly by reason.¹⁶

The introduction of *wahm*, or estimation, to correspond in animals to λογιστική or βουλευτική in man has brought about two other changes in the classification of the internal senses.

In the first place, it has brought about a change in the description of *fikr*, which, as we have seen, was hitherto used as the equivalent of one of the functions of διανοητικόν. From now on, in Arabic as well as in Hebrew and Latin texts which include *fikr* in their classifications, the term *fikr* with its Hebrew and Latin equivalents no longer stands for διάνοια but for διάνοια combined with φαντασία, which may be called φαντασία διανοητική. Though Aristotle uses no such expression, he does use the expression φαντασία λογιστική or βουλευτική, which amounts to the same thing, for διανοητικόν, being a function of νοῦς, is joined with νοῦς by Aristotle (De Anima, II, 3, 414b, 18), and νοῦς is used by him as synonymous with λογιστικόν (ibid., III, 9, 432b, 26). Naturally the function ascribed to *fikr* in its new sense of imagination combined with διάνοια will have to correspond to the function ascribed by Aristotle to διάνοια without imagination, except for such changes as the addition of imagination of necessity will have introduced into it. The faculty of διάνοια uncombined with imagination, as well as the Arabic *fikr* in its earlier usage, as we have seen above, is described by Aristotle as a power of combination and separation;¹⁷ so also now the new usage of *fikr* in the sense of διάνοια combined with imagination is gen-

¹⁶ So stated by Avicenna in Canon (see reference below, n. 31).

¹⁷ Cf. above, Ch. I, nn. 45, 56.

erally described as a power of combination and separation.¹⁸ But the objects which these two faculties are said to combine and separate differ. In the case of *διάνοια* without imagination, it is the combination and separation of ideas, i.e., the formation of positive or negative judgments. In the case of *διάνοια* combined with imagination, it is the combination and separation of the images, i.e., the construction out of images of things existent, new composite images of things nonexistent, or the breaking up of images of things existent into images of things nonexistent. A suggestion of this type of imagination is found in Aristotle, when toward the end of his discussion of rational or deliberative imagination (*φαντασία λογιστική* or *βουλευτική*), i.e., imagination combined with *διάνοια*, he says: "Hence we have the power of constructing a single image out of a number of images."¹⁹

In the second place, it has invested one of the forms of the Arabic word for imagination (*mutahayyilah*) with a special meaning. Hitherto, as we have seen in the *Iḥwân al-Ṣafâ*, *mutahayyilah* was used interchangeably with *tahayyul* and *ḥayâl*²⁰ as the equivalent of the Greek *φαντασία*. From now on it will be used, as a rule, as the equivalent of the Greek *φαντασία* plus *wahm* or *aestimatio*, corresponding in animals to the *φαντασία λογιστική* or *βουλευτική* in man. For with the introduction of *wahm* or *aestimatio* as a sort of intelligence in animals and with the new use of *fikr* in the sense of a compositive sort of imagination resulting from the combination of imagination and reason in man, animals, too, were endowed by philosophers with a compositive sort of imagination, which in them was likewise the result of a combination of the faculty of imagination and the faculty of *wahm* or *aestimatio*. That animals are endowed with a faculty of constructing things analogously to the construction of things by human art is

¹⁸ This is what is primarily meant by the expressions *ترکیب و تفصیل* הרכבה, *componendi et dividendi* (Avicenna, Canon; see below, n. 31), which generally occur in Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin texts in the description of this kind of imagination. Cf. below, Ch. III, n. 17. Sometimes, however, these expressions assume a different meaning in certain texts.

¹⁹ De Anima, III, 11, 434a, 9-10.

²⁰ خیال; تخیل; متخیلة.

recognized by Aristotle in the passage we have quoted above from *Physics*, I, 8, 199a, 20–30, though he attributes it simply to nature without giving to it any special name. Accordingly, in this new classification, while *fikr* in man reflects Aristotle's *φαντασία λογιστική* or *βουλευτική*, *mutahayyilah* in animals cannot be said, strictly speaking, to reflect its antithesis *φαντασία αισθητική*.²¹ If any Greek equivalent is to be found for it, it would be *φαντασία συνετή* or *φρόνιμη* or *προνοητική*, inasmuch as we have shown that *wahm* represents *σύνεσις*, *φρόνησις*, and *πρόνοια*. In our discussion of the subject we shall henceforth designate these two faculties compositive human imagination and compositive animal imagination. They will differ from imagination proper in that the latter has for its function merely the retention of images, on which account we shall call it retentive imagination. The distinction between retentive and compositive imagination is analogous to the modern distinction between reproductive and productive imagination. But I prefer the terms "compositive" and "retentive" because they preserve the original characteristic terms which occur in the descriptions of these two faculties.

The first to introduce *wahm* into the classification of internal senses,²² with the consequent changes in the meaning of *mufakkirah* and the addition of another kind of imagination (*mutahayyilah*), is Alfarabi. Two classifications are given by

²¹ The correspondence of what we have called "compositive human imagination" to *φαντασία λογιστική* and "compositive animal imagination" to *φαντασία αισθητική* has been generally assumed on the ground of the fact that the former two refer to men and the latter two refer to animals. Cf. S. Landauer, op. cit., p. 400, n. 4; S. Horovitz, op. cit., p. 247, n. 85.

²² Independently of the internal senses the estimative faculty has already been described by Isaac Israeli in his *Liber de Definitionibus*, fol. iii, r, a, and as later in Alfarabi and Avicenna and their followers it is ascribed to animals, in whom it corresponds to reason in men: "Et propter hoc facte sunt bestiae estimantes (وَمِمَّنْ ظَاثَةً) non meditantes (مَتَوَهِّمَةً). (בעלי רעיון, מתוהמים)." The term *ظَنَّ*, *aestimatio*, *ומימות*, occurs also in that text. It will have been noticed that the Arabic term used by Isaac Israeli for *aestimatio* is not *wahm* but rather *zann*, which is used by Avicenna as the equivalent of *wahm* (see below, n. 43). The term *wahm* (*meditatio*, *הוהו, רעיון*) is used by him as a description of a faculty which is above *aestimatio* but below *cogitatio* (*fikr*, *מחשבה*). Cf. my paper Isaac Israeli on the Internal Senses in op. cit. See also the discussion of Bahya ibn Paḥḍa, below, nn. 64, 65.

him, one of which contains also a description of each of the faculties in addition to their enumeration,²³ and the other of which contains only an enumeration of terms.²⁴ In the former, five terms are enumerated and explained as follows: (1) imagination, which, unlike the *Iḥwân al-Ṣafâ* and like Aristotle, he describes as having only the function of retaining the images of sensible objects; (2) estimation; (3) memory, which, with the introduction of "estimation," he describes as the retention of the forms of "estimation" instead of those of "cogitation" in the description of the *Iḥwân al-Ṣafâ*; (4) compositive human imagination; (5) compositive animal imagination.²⁵ But though five terms are enumerated here, Alfarabi probably did not mean to give a fivefold classification of internal senses, but rather, like many others after him, as we shall soon see, he counted compositive human and animal imagination as one, thus having all together four internal senses. That four was the number of internal senses meant by him can be confirmed by his other classification. There he gives only four terms, substituting the *fifth* term of the first classification for its *first*. The terms are as follows: (1) imagination (*mutaḥayyilah*), (2) estimation, (3) memory, (4) compositive human imagination.²⁶ Now, if we assume that Alfarabi counts compositive human and animal imagination as one faculty, then we may take the first term (*mutaḥayyilah*) in this classification in the sense of "retentive imagination," in which sense it has been used by the *Iḥwân al-Ṣafâ*, and explain the omission of compositive animal imagination here on the ground of its being

²³ Cf. *Risâlat fuṣuṣ al-Ḥukmun*, § 36, in Fr. Dieterici's *Alfārabi's Philosophische Abhandlungen* (1890), pp. 73 ff. German translation (1892), pp. 121 ff.

²⁴ *ʿUyun al-Musâ'il*, § 20, in op. cit., p. 68. German translation, p. 105. Cf. also A. Schmoelders, *Documenta Philosophiae Arabum* (1836), Arabic, p. 32; Latin, p. 54.

²⁵ (1) مصوّرة, (2) وهم, (3) حافظة, (4) مفكّرة, (5) متخيّلة.

²⁶ والاحساس الباطنة (1) المتخيّلة, (2) والوهم, (3) والذاكرة, (4) والمفكّرة.

Dieterici erroneously takes المتخيّلة as an adjective and translates the passage as follows (op. cit., p. 105): "sowie die inneren vorstellenden Sinne wie Vermutung, Erinnerung, Nachdenken." Schmoelders (op. cit., p. 55) translates it correctly: "varii sensus interni modi, imaginatio scilicet, informatio, recordatio, cogitatio." Schmoelders' translation of *wahm* by *informatio*, however, is inaccurate.

counted as one faculty with compositive human imagination. But if we assume that Alfarabi counted them in his other classification as two faculties, then however the term *mutahayyilah* is taken in this classification, whether in the sense of retentive imagination or in the sense of compositive animal imagination, there will be no adequate explanation for Alfarabi's omission here of one of the five faculties enumerated in the other list. Despite these fourfold classifications, however, Alfarabi sometimes uses the general term imagination to include both retentive and compositive imagination as well as estimation.²⁷

In none of the classifications of the internal senses we have thus far discussed is the Aristotelian common sense expressly mentioned, though in Augustine and Gregory the Great two of its functions are ascribed to the internal sense in general and in the Iḥwân al-Şafâ one of its functions is included in the description of imagination. Isaac Israeli, who does make mention of common sense, excludes it from both the internal and external senses, or, as he calls them, spiritual and corporeal senses, and makes of it a neutral sense occupying an intermediate position between the two.²⁸ The first to specifically include common sense in his classification of the internal senses is Avicenna. The characteristic description of common sense which recurs in his writings is analogous to Aristotle's characterization of it as the faculty which distinguishes and compares the data of sense-perception.²⁹ In the language of Avicenna it is described as the sense wherein the impressions conveyed through the sense-organs are assembled and unified — a descrip-

²⁷ Cf. Sefer ha-Haṭḥalot (in Z. Filipowsky's Sefer ha-Asif, Leipzig, 1849), p. 3: "The imaginative faculty is that which [a] retains the impressions of the sensible objects after the latter have disappeared from sense-perception, and [b] combines some of these impressions with others and separates some of them from others. . . . [c] Moreover, to this faculty belongs also the apprehension of that which is beneficial or injurious, pleasant or unpleasant." The three functions ascribed here to imagination correspond respectively to (a) retentive imagination, (b) compositive imagination, and (c) estimation.

²⁸ חוש רוחני, *sensus spiritualis*; חוש ושמאי, *sensus corporeus*. Liber de Elementis, II, Latin, fol. ix, r, a; Hebrew, pp. 53-54. Ibid.: "cum sit [*sensus communis*] inter sensum visibilem scilicet corporeum et informatum qui est in anteriori parte cerebri nominatum phantasia, et propter hoc nominatur sensus communis."

²⁹ De Anima, III, 2, 426b, 8-427a, 16.

tion which, as we have seen, is used also by the Iḥwân al-Ṣafâ and reflects a statement by Aristotle in *De Sensu et Sensibili*, 7, 449a, 3-10.³⁰ Its location, in agreement with Galen rather than with Aristotle, is, like that of retentive imagination, in the anterior hollow of the brain.

With this introduction of common sense the classification of the internal senses is completed. There are now all together seven faculties included under the internal senses: (1) common sense, (2) retentive imagination, (3) compositive animal imagination, (4) compositive human imagination, (5) estimation, (6) memory, (7) recollection. The characteristic expressions used in the description of these seven terms are as follows: (1) common sense is the center at which all the senses converge; it distinguishes between the qualities of the different senses; it adds the element of consciousness to sensation; but while it *receives* all the impressions of the senses, it does not *retain* them. (2) Retentive imagination *retains* the impressions of the sensible objects *received* by common sense after the objects have disappeared. (3) Compositive animal and (4) human imagination consists in the construction of new unreal images out of real images. (5) Estimation perceives the insensible forms connected with sensible objects and knows what is to be pursued and what is to be avoided. (6) Memory retains the forms of estimation just as retentive imagination retains the forms of sensible objects. (7) Recollection is the restoration of something to memory after it has been forgotten.

Still, not all of these seven are considered by Avicenna as distinct faculties. Some of them are combined by him to form one faculty, with the result that the seven are reduced to five. But Avicenna does not seem to be decided as to which of these seven faculties should be combined, and consequently various combinations are to be found in his Canon,³¹ *Al-Shifâ'*,³² *Al-*

³⁰ Cf. *Risâlah fi al-Nafs*, Ch. 7 (see below, n. 34) and see above, Ch. I, n. 43.

³¹ Canon, Lib. I, Fen I, Doctrina VI, Cap. 5. Arabic text (Rome, 1593), fol. 35; Latin text (Venice, 1582), fol. 27 v; Hebrew text (Naples, 1491).

³² *Al-Shifâ'*. Arabic text unavailable at present writing, but scheme of classification and terminology used in it are the same as in *Al-Najât*. Latin translation of part dealing with soul in Avicenna, *De Anima* (Pavia, c. 1485), fols. 7d-8a, 28d-34c. Analysis of this work in M. Winter, *Über Avicennas Opus egregium de anima (Liber sextus naturalium)* (München, 1903).

Najât,³³ and Risâlah fi al-Nafs.³⁴ These varieties of combination relate (a) to common sense and imagination; (b) to compositive imagination, both animal and human, and estimation; (c) to memory and recollection. We shall comment upon these three types of combination one by one.

(a) With regard to common sense and imagination two views are recorded by Avicenna in Canon. According to the philosophers, common sense and imagination are distinct faculties, the former being the *recipient* of the images of things, the latter the *retainer*³⁵ of the images. According to the physicians, the two constitute a single faculty, though the distinction between the receptive power and the retentive power is still to be observed in it. In Al-Najât, however, he follows the philosophers' view and treats common sense and imagination as two faculties, one receptive and the other retentive, but, curiously enough, he reproduces the Greek word *φαντασία* in Arabic transliteration and makes it synonymous with "common sense," as if he did not know that the Greek term meant imagination, which he, following the philosophers, treats here as a faculty distinct from common sense.³⁶ In Risâlah fi al-Nafs, on the other hand, he seems to go even further than the physicians mentioned in Canon, for he not only treats common sense and imagination as one faculty but even identifies them, defining both of them in terms of common sense, and making no mention of any distinction between *reception* and *retention* within it.

Now, who are the physicians to whom Avicenna refers as combining common sense and imagination into one? Naturally one would be inclined to identify them with Galen and his

³³ Al-Najât, II: Physics, p. 45. Published together with Canon, Rome, 1593.

³⁴ Risâlah fi al-Nafs, Ch. 7. Arabic original with German translation and notes under the title of Die Psychologie des Ibn Sînâ by S. Landauer in Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 29 (1875), pp. 335 ff.

³⁵ "Et quae harum duarum est recipiens (القوة القابلة) alia est a custodiante (الحافظة, השומר).".

³⁶ In Isaac Israeli's Liber de Elementis, II (Latin, fol. ix, r, a; Hebrew, p. 53), the Greek *φαντασία* is correctly identified with imagination: "Et informatum (*imaginatio*, cf. below, Ch. III, p. 116) qui est in anteriori parte cerebri nominatum phantasia." המצייר שהוא בבטן המוקדם שבמח [הנקרא אל] פנטסמיה.

followers. But Galen never clearly stated that common sense and imagination were one. In fact the term "common sense" does not occur in his writings. The only evidence one can advance for this identification is the fact that in his enumeration of the faculties of the soul the terms *φαντασία*, *διανοητικόν*, and *μνημονικόν* are mentioned immediately after the five senses, and no mention at all is made of common sense. But for that matter Aristotle himself never includes common sense in his various enumerations of the faculties of the soul,³⁷ and in one place he says that while the faculty of imagination and that of common sense are identical, they still differ in their essential notion.³⁸ Furthermore, Isaac Israeli, who was a physician, and according to Maimonides more of a physician than a philosopher,³⁹ does not, as we have seen, identify common sense and imagination.⁴⁰

Evidently Avicenna does not mean to contrast here the view of any particular physician or of any group of physicians or of physicians in general with that of philosophers in general. What he means to contrast are the two ways in which the internal senses may be viewed, the medical or physiological and the philosophical, without one's necessarily excluding the other. He himself seems to combine in his various writings these two ways, and so also does Averroes, as we shall see later. Now from the physiological point of view the faculties of the soul are regarded only with reference to the bodily organs in which they reside and not with reference to the variety of functions which they perform, for physicians, as says Avicenna in connection with the estimative faculty, concern themselves with faculties of the soul only in so far as a hindrance in their functioning can be traced to an injury in the bodily organs in which they are located. Consequently, if two functionally

³⁷ Cf. *De Anima*, II, 3, 414a, 29 ff.; III, 9, 431a, 29 ff.

³⁸ *De Somniis*, I, 459a, 15-17: καὶ ἔστι μὲν τὸ αὐτὸ τῷ αἰσθητικῷ τὸ φανταστικόν, τὸ δ' εἶναι φανταστικῷ καὶ αἰσθητικῷ ἕτερον. The term αἰσθητικῷ in this passage is generally understood to refer to "common sense." Cf. below, n. 94. For the meaning of τὸ εἶναι, see G. Rodier's note on *De Anima*, II, 1, 412b, 11, in his *Aristotle: Traité de l'Ame*, II, 180.

³⁹ Letter to Samuel Ibn Tibbon in *Köbez Teshubot ha-Rambam we-Iggerotaw*, II, 28b.

⁴⁰ Cf. above, n. 28.

different faculties of the soul reside in one bodily organ, then physicians will regard them as one faculty, inasmuch as any injury in that organ will affect the two faculties alike. From this point of view, then, common sense and imagination are to be considered as one faculty, inasmuch as the seat of both of them is in the anterior ventricle of the brain, and it is perhaps for this reason that Galen has enumerated only three post-sensational faculties. From the philosophic point of view, however, a faculty is that which has a distinctive function, irrespective of its location in the brain. For this reason, common sense and imagination are according to them two faculties. If the philosophers themselves, as Avicenna reports, are in doubt as to whether memory and recollection are two distinct faculties, it is because they are in doubt whether these two have distinct functions.

(b) With regard to compositive human and animal imagination and estimation, in Canon Avicenna treats them all as one faculty. In *Al-Shifâ'* and *Al-Najât* no numbers are given, but from the context it is quite evident that compositive human and animal imagination is treated as one faculty, whereas estimation is treated as a separate faculty. In *Risâlah fi al-Nafs*, again, no numbers are given, but from the context it is quite certain that estimation is a distinct faculty by itself, and with less certainty it would seem that compositive animal imagination and compositive human imagination are counted as two faculties.

(c) Similarly with regard to memory and recollection, in Canon Avicenna refers to a difference of opinion even among philosophers as to whether they constitute one faculty or two faculties; in *Al-Shifâ'*, *Al-Najât*, and *Risâlah fi al-Nafs*, however, he makes no distinction between memory and recollection.

In correspondence with this variety of combinations, Avicenna gives in Canon three kinds of classifications of the internal senses. First, a threefold classification: (1) (a) common sense and (b) imagination (defined in terms of common sense); (2) compositive (a) human and (b) animal imagination and (c) estimation; (3) (a) memory and (b) recollection. Second, a fourfold classification, by counting common sense and

imagination as two. Third, a fivefold classification, by counting memory and recollection as two.⁴¹ In Al-Shifá' and Al-Najât the classification would seem to be fivefold, as follows: (1) common sense, synonymous with the Arabic transliteration of the Greek *φαντασία*, (2) retentive imagination, (3) compositive (*a*) animal and (*b*) human imagination, (4) estimation, (5) memory and recollection.⁴² In *Risâlah fi al-Nafs* the classification would also seem to be fivefold, but arranged as follows: (1) common sense and imagination, the latter not only identified with common sense but also defined as common sense; (2) compositive animal imagination; (3) estimation; (4) memory and recollection; (5) compositive human imagination.⁴³

⁴¹ (1) الحس المشترك, החוש המשותף, *sensus communis*.

(2) דמיון, خیال, *phantasia*.

(3) מחשב, مفكرة, *cogitativa*.

מדמה, متخیلة, *imaginativa*.

מחשב, وهمية, *existimativa*.

(4) שומר, حافظة, *conservativa*.

(5) זכר, זכרה, *memorialis*.

⁴² (1) الحس المشترك, *sensus communis*.

(2) فنتاسيا (Shahrastani: بنطاسيا), *phantasia*.

(3) خیال, *imaginatio*.

مصورة, *vis formans, virtus formalis*.

(4) متخیلة, *imaginativa*.

مفكرة, *cogitativa*.

(5) وهمية, *aestimativa, extimativa*.

(6) حافظة, *memorialis*.

ذاکرة, *reminiscibilis*.

Winter, op. cit. (above, n. 32), p. 29, n. 1, has failed to see the distinction which we have made here between the identification of the term "common sense" with the Greek term *phantasia* and the identification of the faculties of common sense and imagination.

⁴³ (1) الحس المشترك والمتصورة (more likely: متخیلة, cf. Landauer, op. cit., p. 359, n. 10; but see quotation from Cuzari, III, 5, below, nn. 59, 61), (2) تخيل, (3) المفكرة, (4) الحافظة والمتذكرة, (5) المتوهمة والظائنة. Landauer (op. cit.) makes of these a threefold classification, as follows: I = our 1; II = our 2 and 3;

The successors of Avicenna follow his example of including common sense in their classifications, and also show his indecision as to its relation to the imaginative faculty; but occasionally, as we shall see, they depart from him in the combination of the various faculties, or in the order of their arrangement, or even in the description of the functions of some of them. Shahrastani's classification⁴⁴ is an exact reproduction of the classification in Al-Najât, even to the inclusion of the Arabic transliteration of the Greek *φαντασία* as the synonym of common sense. Algazali differs in his various writings. In Maḳâṣid al-Falâsifah⁴⁵ he follows Avicenna's Al-Najât in counting common sense and imagination as two faculties. In his Mîzân al-'Amal⁴⁶ and Tahâfut al-Falâsifah,⁴⁷ however, he follows Avicenna's Risâlah fi al-Nafs and identifies common sense with imagination. But in departure from all the works of Avicenna, Algazali, as we are now going to show, uses the ordinary Arabic word for memory in a manner which is quite unique.

Hitherto memory has been described after Aristotle as a sort of retentive power like imagination, but unlike imagination, which retains the images of sense-perceptions, it retains either the judgments of the cogitative power (*mufakkirah*), according to the Ihwân al-Şafâ, or the forms of the estimative power (*wahm*), according to Alfarabi and Avicenna.⁴⁸ Further-

III = our 4 and 5. But I can see no ground on which his threefold classification is based, unless it was meant to correspond to the Galenic threefold classification. Avicenna's classification here, however, has no relation to the Galenic classification.

⁴⁴ Kitâb al-Milal wal-Nihâl, ed. Cureton, pp. 416-417.

⁴⁵ Maḳâṣid al-Falâsifah, III: Physics, IV (Cairo, without date), pp. 284-286. Hebrew translation, Kawwanot ha-Pilosofim, MS. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Cod. Heb. 901. Latin translation, Algazel's Metaphysics (ed. J. T. Muckle, Toronto, 1933), pp. 169-171.

⁴⁶ Mîzân al-'Amal [IV], Cairo, A. H. 1328, pp. 19-20. Hebrew: Mozenê Zedeḳ, IV (ed. J. Goldenthal, Leipzig and Paris, 1839), pp. 30-31.

⁴⁷ Algazel: Tahafot al-Falasifat, XVIII (ed. M. Bouyges, Beyrouth, 1927), pp. 298-300. Hebrew: Hapalat ha-Pilosofim, XVIII, MS. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Cod. Heb. 910. Latin translation in the Latin translation from the Hebrew of Averroes' Destructio Destructionum, In Physicis, II (Venice, 1527).

⁴⁸ The contrast between "retentive imagination" and "memory" is expressed in Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin texts by describing the former as خزانة الصور, זכרון, and *imago*.

more, the seat of imagination is the anterior ventricle of the brain, whereas the seat of memory is the posterior ventricle of the brain. Then also, in all the Arabic texts which we have hitherto examined, two terms, *ḥāfiẓah* (lit. "conservation") and *ḍākirah*⁴⁹ (lit. "memory"), have been used indiscriminately for memory, though occasionally the latter term had the more specific meaning of "recollection."⁵⁰ Now, in Algazali we notice a departure from these usages in all his three works. In *Mizân al-'Amal* he follows on the whole Avicenna's *Risâlah fi al-Nafs* in combining common sense and imagination into one faculty, defining both of them in terms of common sense and as a *receptive* faculty. But departing from the *Risâlah fi al-Nafs* he includes in his classification also a *retentive* faculty, defined in the same manner as retentive imagination is defined by the *Iḥwân al-Ṣafâ*, Alfarabi, and Avicenna in his *Canon* and *Al-Najât*. But instead of applying to this retentive faculty the term "imagination" he applies to it the term "conservation" (*ḥāfiẓah*), which as we have seen is generally used in the sense of "memory." He further places this faculty of conservation in the anterior ventricle of the brain, where usually retentive imagination is placed. In *Maḳâṣid al-Falâsifah*, where retentive imagination is treated as a faculty distinct from common sense, the term "conservation" is used as synonymous with it, and the faculty of conservation is again located in the anterior ventricle of the brain. In *Tahâfut al-Falâsifah* common sense and imagination are identified and "conservation" is defined in terms of retentive imagination,

הצורות, *arca formarum*, and the latter by الخزائن المعانی, *arca intentionum* (cf. below, Ch. III, n. 18). The term *arca* with its Arabic and Hebrew equivalents reflects the Greek *ταμειον* which is used as a description of memory by John of Damascus in *De Fide Orthodoxa*, II, 20. Instead of *arca* the term *thesaurus* is sometimes used. Cf. below, Ch. III, n. 18.

ذاكرة, حافظه⁴⁹. The term *conservatio* with its Arabic and Hebrew equivalents reflect the Greek *σωτηρια* used in connection with memory by Plato in *Philebus* 34 A and by John of Damascus in *De Fide Orthodoxa*, II, 20, and *συντήρησις* used in connection with memory by Galen in *Definitiones Medicae*, 124 (*Opera Omnia*, ed. Kühn, XIX, 381). It may reflect also Aristotle's *φαντάσματος ἕξις* in *De Memoria et Reminiscencia*, I, 451a, 15-16.

⁵⁰ As, for instance, in *Canon*, *Al-Shifâ'*, *Al-Najât*, *Risâlah fi al-Nafs*.

taking the place of retentive imagination, but the location of conservation is not specified. This use of the term "conservation" (*ḥāfiẓah*) in the sense of "retentive imagination," it may be remarked in passing, is evidently followed also by Damiri in his threefold Galenic classification, where the term "imagination" is replaced by the term "conservation."⁵¹

Another important difference between Avicenna and Algazali, and in each of them between their various works, is to be found with regard to the location of *wahm*. Avicenna, in several of his works, places it "at the end of the middle hollow of the brain,"⁵² but in one work he places it "in the whole brain, but especially at the border line of compositive animal imagination."⁵³ Algazali in one of his works places it "at the end of the middle hollow of the brain,"⁵⁴ but in his two other works he places it together with memory "in the posterior hollow (or part) of the brain."⁵⁵

With this change in the meaning of "conservation," Algazali arranges the internal sense in *Mizân al-'Amal* as follows: (1) common sense and imagination, identified and defined in terms of common sense as a recipient power, (2) conservation, defined as retentive imagination and located in the anterior ventricle of the brain, (3) estimation, (4) memory, (5) compositive animal and human imagination.⁵⁶ In *Tahâfut al-*

⁵¹ Damiri's classification is quoted by I. Goldziher, *Muhammedanischer Aberglaube über Gedächtnisskraft und Vergesslichkeit in Festschrift zum siebenzigsten Geburtstage A. Berliner's* (1903), p. 138, n. 4: (1) *قوة الحفظ*, (2) *قوة الفكر*, (3) *قوة الذكر*.

⁵² *Al-Shifâ'*, *Al-Najât*, and also *Shahrastani*. Latin of *Al-Shifâ'* (Avicenna, *De Anima*) reads: "in summo mediae concavitatis cerebri" (fol. 8a). "Summo" here represents the Arabic *نهاية* and means "extremo" or "extremity." Winter (op. cit., p. 31) translates it by "oberst (hinterst)." This passage is also quoted in the name of Avicenna by Albertus Magnus in *Isagoge in Libros de Anima*, Cap. 18.

⁵³ *Risâlah fi al-Nafs*, Ch. 7 (op. cit., pp. 360, 402). Cf. also S. Horowitz, op. cit., p. 251, n. 93.

⁵⁴ *Mizân al-'Amal*, loc. cit.

⁵⁵ *Maḳâsid al-Falâsifah*, loc. cit.: "estimativa, et memorialis in posteriore parte cerebri"; *Tahâfut al-Falâsifah*, loc. cit.: "locus eius est ventriculum ultimum cerebri."

⁵⁶ (1) *חוש משוחך, חסן משתכח, דמיון, خیال* (4) *זכרון*.

(2) *שומר, حافظה*.

(5) *מחשב, חושב, מפקד*.

(3) *רעיוני, רעיונית*.

מתחילה.

Falâsifah he first gives a threefold classification: (1) common sense and imagination, identified and defined in terms of common sense as a recipient power, (2) estimation, (3) compositive animal and human imagination. Then he adds two more: (4) conservation, defined as retentive imagination, and (5) memory.⁵⁷ In Maḳâṣid al-Falâsifah his fivefold classification is as follows: (1) common sense, (2) retentive imagination or conservation, (3) estimation, (4) memory, (5) compositive animal and human imagination.⁵⁸

The influence of Avicenna's classifications is to be traced in the writings of Judah ha-Levi, Baḥya ibn Paḳuda, and Abraham ibn Daud.

Judah ha-Levi has two classifications. One is only an enumeration of terms; the other contains also a description of functions. In neither of them is the number five mentioned. But both would seem to contain a fivefold division similar to that of the Risâlah fi al-Nafs, where common sense is identified with imagination, and compositive animal imagination and

⁵⁷ (1) דמיוני, خیالیه, *imaginativa*.

חוש משותף, חֶסֶם מְשָׁרָף, *sensus communis*.

(2) מחשבי, وهمیة, *cogitativa*.

(3) מדמה, متخیلة, *imaginativa*.

מחשב, مفكرة, *extimativa*.

(4) שומר, حافظه, *conservativa*.

(5) זכר, ווכר, *memorativa*.

Note the reverse use of *cogitativa* and *extimativa* in this Latin translation. This is due to the fact that in Hebrew, from which this Latin translation was made, one and the same term is used in both instances. Cf. also use of *cogitatio* for *aestimatio* in Buxtorf's translation of Cuzari below, nn. 59, 61.

⁵⁸ (1) חֶסֶם מְשָׁרָף, حֶסֶם מְשָׁרָף, *sensus communis*.

(2) מצייך, متصورة, *imaginativa*.

שומר, حافظه, *retentiva*.

(3) מחשבי, מחשב, وهمیة, *estimativa*.

(4) זכר, ווכר, *memorialis*.

(5) דמיוני, מדמה, متخیلة, *fantasia* (erroneously *cogitacio* in MS. Vat. Lat. 4481 as reproduced by Muckle in Algazel's Metaphysics, p. 170; cf. also *cogitativa* on p. 169).

מחשב, مفكرة, *cogitativa*.

compositive human imagination are counted as two distinct faculties. In his first classification, the order differs somewhat from that of the *Risâlah fi al-Nafs*. It reads as follows: (1) common sense, (2) compositive animal imagination, (3) estimation, (4) compositive human imagination, (5) memory.⁵⁹ In his second classification, the order is the same as that in *Risâlah fi al-Nafs*, and is as follows: (1) common sense or retentive imagination,⁶⁰ (2) compositive animal imagination, (3) estimation, (4) memory, (5) compositive human imagination.⁶¹ But the location of the estimative faculty given in this second classification is a corruption of that in *Risâlah fi al-Nafs*. It reads: "The seat of estimation is the whole brain, principally the border-line of retentive imagination."⁶²

One of the puzzling classifications is that of Bahya.⁶³ It contains five terms, but two of these five terms, the *third* and the *fifth*, are not found in the Avicennian lists. If we take

⁵⁹ Cuzari, III, 5 (Arabic and Hebrew: *Das Buch Al-Chazari*, ed. H. Hirschfeld, 1887, pp. 144, 145; Latin translation: *Liber Cosri*, by J. Buxtorf, Fil., Basel, 1660, p. 158):

- (1) حَسٌّ مَشْتَرَكٌ, הרגשה משתתפת, *sensus communis*.
- (2) תַּחֲוִיל, יצר, *phantasia*.
- (3) רַעֲיוֹן, והם, *cogitatio* (see above, n. 57).
- (4) מַחֲשָׁב, פִּקְרָא, *imaginatio* (note unusual Latin translation).
- (5) זְכוּרֹן, וזכר, *memoria*.

⁶⁰ Its definition differs from that of *Risâlah fi al-Nafs*.

⁶¹ Cuzari, V, 12 (Arabic and Hebrew, pp. 312 ff.; Latin, pp. 343 ff.):

- (1) חֲסֵה מְשִׁתֶּתֶפֶת, הרגשה משתתפת, *sensus communis*.
- הַצֵּטִיירוֹחַ, תַּצְוֹר, *formatio*.
- (2) מִתְחַיָּה, יצרי, *imaginatrix, phantasia*; יצרי, מִתְחַיָּה, *imaginatrix*.
- יצר, תַּחֲוִיל, *reminiscentia*.
- (3) מַחֲשָׁבִי, מַחֲשָׁבִי, *cogitativa, cogitatrix* (see above, n. 57).
- (4) שׁוֹמֵר, חֲפָצָה, *retinens, conservatrix*.
- זְכוּרֹן, תַּדְּקָר, וזכר, מַדְּקָרָה, *memoria*.
- (5) מַחֲשָׁבִי, מַפְקָרָה, (left untranslated).

⁶² Cf. above, n. 53.

⁶³ *Hobot ha-Lebabot*, I, 10 (Arabic: *Al-Hidaja 'ila Farā'id al-Qulūb*, ed. A. S. Yahuda, p. 83): (1) זְכוּרֹן, וזכרון, (2) מַחֲשָׁבָה, פִּקְרָא, (3) רַעֲיוֹן, خَاطِر, (4) זִמֵּם, זִמֵּם, (5) תַּמְיִיז, תַּמְיִיז. Cf. D. Kaufmann, *Die Theologie des Bahya Ibn Pakuda in Gesam-melte Schriften* (1910), II, p. 12, n. 1; S. Horovitz, *op. cit.*, p. 256, n. 104.

Bahya's classification, however, to be of the same type as Judah ha-Levi's first classification, the meaning of its unusual terms can be explained. The *first* and *second* terms in Bahya offer no difficulty, for they are exactly the same as the *fifth* and *fourth* terms in Judah ha-Levi. The *third* term (*hatir*) does not occur in the Avicennian classifications, but inasmuch as the *fourth* term (*ẓann*) is used in both Avicenna's *Risâlah fi al-Nafs*⁶⁴ and Isaac Israeli's *Liber de Definitionibus*⁶⁵ in the sense of estimation, i.e., the *third* term (*wahm*) in Judah ha-Levi, we can take the term *hatir* in the sense of compositive animal imagination, i.e., the *second* term (*tahayyul*) in Judah ha-Levi. Finally, the *fifth* term in Bahya (*tamayyuz*) has already been shown to refer to common sense⁶⁶ and thus corresponds to the *first* term in Judah ha-Levi. Bahya's list thus contains a fivefold classification like that of Judah ha-Levi's first list, and it runs as follows: (1) memory, (2) compositive human imagination, (3) compositive animal imagination, (4) estimation, (5) common sense.

While Judah ha-Levi and probably also Bahya follow the classification of the *Risâlah fi al-Nafs*, Abraham ibn Daud follows that of the *Al-Shifâ'* and *Al-Najât*, except that he does not reproduce the transliterated form of the Greek *φαντασία* and use it as synonymous with common sense. The list runs as follows: (1) common sense, (2) retentive imagination, (3) compositive animal and human imagination, (4) estimation, (5) memory.⁶⁷

A departure from the Avicennian type of classification is to be found in Averroes.

⁶⁴ Cf. above, n. 43.

⁶⁵ Cf. above, n. 22. Judah ibn Tibbon, who translated both Bahya and Judah ha-Levi into Hebrew, must have taken the term *זמם*, *ẓann*, in the sense of compositive animal imagination, for he translates *خاطر* by *רעיון*, which in Judah ha-Levi he uses as a translation of *وهم*, i.e., estimation.

⁶⁶ Cf. S. Horovitz, op. cit., p. 256, n. 104. This is not to be confused with the term *مميز* which is used in connection with *διάνοια* (cf. above, Ch. I, nn. 47, 48, 56, and below, n. 73). The application of the term *κρίνειν* to common sense occurs in *De Anima*, III, 2, 426b, 8 ff., and *De Somno et Vigilia*, 2, 455a, 17-20.

⁶⁷ (1) זוכר, (2) רעיוני, (3) מחשב, (4) מדמה, (5) מצייר, (6) חוש משותף.

Averroes openly rejects the introduction of estimation as a special faculty.⁶⁸ He contends that the ancients do not mention it and that it was introduced by Avicenna — a contention which but for the fact that estimation is already used as an internal sense by Alfarabi and independently of the internal senses by Isaac Israeli⁶⁹ is quite correct. He further maintains that according to the ancients the unspecified faculty of imagination⁷⁰ with which animals are generally assumed to be endowed contains also the function of the estimative faculty. Incidentally it may be remarked that Avicenna himself in his discussion of the estimative faculty in the Canon refers to some persons who call that faculty imagination, and proceeds to say that he has no objection to calling it by that name provided that the function of the estimative faculty is differentiated from the other functions of imagination.⁷¹ This is as much as is definitely stated by Averroes in his *Tahâfut al-Tahâfut*. But he does not definitely say there that Avicenna's compositive animal imagination (*mutahayyilah*) and retentive imagination (*hayaliyyah*) are considered by him as one faculty, though this may be implied in the emphasis with which he restates Avicenna's view. Nor does he definitely say that he does not use the term *fikr* in the Avicennian sense of compositive human imagination but rather in its older sense as the equivalent of *διανοητικόν* or human reason, though indirectly it may be inferred that this is the sense in which he uses that term throughout his discussion in the passage in question.

But that Averroes differs from Avicenna on all these points

⁶⁸ Averroes: *Tahafot at-Tahafot*, II (XVIII) (ed. M. Bouyges, Beyrouth, 1930), pp. 546-547. Latin translation from the Hebrew by Calo Calonymos: *Destructio Destructionum*, In *Physicis*, *Disputatio II* (Venice, 1527).

⁶⁹ Cf. above, n. 22.

⁷⁰ Throughout his discussion in the passage referred to above in n. 68 Averroes uses the term *متخيلة* in the general sense of imagination, which is his own use of the term, though Algazali uses it in the special sense of compositive animal imagination. Cf. below, n. 73.

⁷¹ Cf. Canon, loc. cit.: "Quidam autem hominum sunt qui praesumunt et hanc virtutem [i.e., virtutem existimativam] imaginativam [תַּחֲבִיל, דַּמִּין] vocant, sed tamen non curamus, quia de nominibus non disputamus, sed intentiones et differentias intelligere debemus." Cf. also Alfarabi's inclusion of the estimative faculty under imagination, above, n. 27.

may be inferred from a passage in his Epitome of De Memoria et Reminiscentia, referred to by him here in Tahâfut al-Tahâfut under the general title of De Sensu et Sensati.⁷² That passage contains a fivefold enumeration of the stages of knowledge, the first of which is sense-perception. The subsequent four stages are indirectly a fourfold classification of the "internal" senses, which Averroes here calls "spiritual." They are as follows: (1) common sense, (2) imaginative faculty, (3) cogitative or discriminative faculty, (4) memorative faculty.⁷³ The fact that both compositive animal imagination and estimation are omitted indicates that he considered them, together with retention, as sub-functions of imagination. Furthermore, the fact that cogitation (*fikr*) is used by him synonymously with the discriminative (*munayyiz*) faculty, which, as we have seen above, is considered by Aristotle, John of Damascus, and the Ihwân al-Şafâ as a sub-function of διανοητικόν,⁷⁴ shows that he took *fikr*, unlike Avicenna, in the sense of human thinking and not in the sense of compositive human imagination. In a passage in his long commentary on De Anima,⁷⁵ referring to that

⁷² Arabic and Hebrew texts edited by H. Blumberg and to be published in Corpus Commentariorum Averrois in Aristotelem. Latin in Aristotelis omnia quae extant opera. . . . Venetiis, apud Iuntas, VI, Pars 2, 1574, fols. 21 M-22 B.

⁷³ (1) حَسَّ مشترك, חוש משותף, *sensus communis*.

(2) מַדְמָה, متخيلة, *imaginans*.

מַצַּיִר, مصور, *imaginans*.

(3) מַחֲשֵׁב, מחשב, *cogitativa*.

בּוֹרֵר, مميز, *distinctiva*.

(4) שׁוֹמֵר, حافظة, *conservans*.

זָכוֹר, ذاكرة, *rememorativa, memorans*.

(De Memoria et Reminiscentia: Averrois Paraphraisis. Op. cit., fol. 21 M-22 B).

These four stages of knowledge are described by Averroes as spiritual (روحاني, *spiritualis*), in contrast to the five senses which are described by him as corporeal (جسماني, *corporalis*), and they are arranged by him according to their order of spirituality, the fourth being the most spiritual.

The term *distinctiva* with its Arabic and Hebrew equivalents reflects the Greek κριτική which is used by Aristotle as a description of one of the functions of διάνοια. Cf. above, Ch. I, nn. 47, 48, 56.

⁷⁴ Cf. above, Ch. I, nn. 45-48, 55, 56.

⁷⁵ Hebrew, MS. Berlin 1888.2, to be published in Corpus Commentariorum Aver-

passage in the *Epitome of De Memoria et Reminiscentia*, Averroes says more directly that Aristotle has posited four stages of "immaterial faculties,"⁷⁶ namely, (1) common sense, (2) imagination, (3) cogitation, (4) memory.⁷⁷ In *De Memoria et Reminiscentia*⁷⁸ Averroes further states that what man performs by "thought and deliberation" animals perform by "nature."⁷⁹ But that "nature," he adds, has no special name; Avicenna, however, calls it "estimation."⁸⁰ But, as we have seen, there is another difference between Avicenna and Averroes with regard to estimation. According to Avicenna it is a separate faculty in animals; according to Averroes it is a sub-function of imagination.

But very often Averroes follows those whom Avicenna describes as "physicians" and reduces his fourfold classification of post-sensatory faculties to three, corresponding to the three ventricles of the brain in which they are localized. This threefold classification omits *sensus communis*, evidently because it is in the same ventricle as imagination. The three enumerated sometimes read: (1) *imaginativa*, (2) *cogitativa*, (3) *memorativa*,⁸¹ and sometimes they read: (1) *imaginatio*,

rois in Aristotelem. Latin in Aristotelis omnia quae extant opera. . . . Venetiis, apud Iuntas, VI, Pars 1, 1574.

⁷⁶ Ibid., Lib. III, § 6, fol. 154 B: "cum posuit virtutes individuales distinctas in quatuor ordinibus," כאשר הניח כחות נבדלים אישיים בארבע מדרגות. I take it that the Latin *distinctus* in this passage reflects the Arabic مفرق and is a mistranslation. It should be *separatas* or *separabiles*. The Hebrew נבדלים may likewise mean both *distinctas* and *separabiles*. *Virtutes distinctas* thus means here *virtutes separabiles*, which is the same as *virtutes spirituales* and hence the equivalent of *sensus spirituales* or *interiores*. Cf. above, Ch. I, nn. 1-8.

⁷⁷ (1) חוש משותף, *sensus communis*.

(2) מדמה, *imaginativa*.

(3) מחשבי, *cogitativa* (also described as: "virtus *distinctiva* individualis," אשר יבחין האיש).

(4) שומר, *rememorativa*. For the term *distinctiva* see above, n. 73.

⁷⁸ Op. cit., fol. 21 G.

⁷⁹ Cf. above, Ch. I, n. 35. For "nature" terms used are: טבע, *natura*. Averroes' statement in this passage is obviously based upon *Physics*, II, 8, 199a, 20-30, referred to above, n. 16.

⁸⁰ فهم, דמיון, *existimatio*.

⁸¹ Long Commentary on *De Anima*, III, 6, fol. 154 A:

(1) מדמה, *imaginativa*.

(2) *ratio et cogitatio*, (3) *memoria et conservatio*.⁸² In another place, after giving a threefold classification, containing (1) *imaginativa*, (2) *cogitativa*, (3) *reminiscibilis et conservativa*, he adds that *cogitativa* is only in man; in beasts *aestimativa* takes its place.⁸³ As we have seen, this reflects the terminology of Avicenna.

We have already seen above ⁸⁴ how Maimonides enumerates three internal senses which we have identified with the Galenic imagination, cogitation, and memory. This in itself, however, would not make him depart from Avicenna, whom as a rule he follows, for even with his adoption of Avicenna's five-fold philosophical classification of the internal senses he could still have, as did Averroes, an additional physiological three-fold classification. But in our special study of Maimonides on the internal senses we have shown how in several places of his writings, under the general term "imagination," he has described the functions of those internal senses which Avicenna would describe as (1) common sense, (2) retentive imagination, (3) compositive human imagination, (4) compositive animal imagination, (5) estimation. The inclusion of these five internal senses under the term "imagination," we have also tried to show in that study, does not prove that Maimonides aligned himself with Averroes in opposition to Avicenna. Maimonides' comprehensive use of the term "imagination" is followed in a passage which occurs with but a few slight verbal changes in *Ruah Hen* ⁸⁵ by an uncertain author and in *Sha'ar*

(2) מחשבי, *cogitativa*.

(3) שומר, *rememorativa*.

Ibid., III, 20, fol. 164 C:

(1) מרמה, *imaginativa*.

(2) מחשבי, *cogitativa*.

(3) וזכר, *rememorativa*.

⁸² Colliget, Lib. III, Cap. 40 (Aristotelis omnia quae extant opera. . . Venetiis, apud Iuntas, X, 1574, fol. 56 BC).

⁸³ Ibid., Lib. II, Cap. 20 (fol. 30 FG): "Propterea non invenitur haec virtus nisi in homine: et animali bruto concessa fuit aestimativa loco istius."

⁸⁴ Cf. above, Ch. I, n. 27.

⁸⁵ *Ruah Hen*, Ch. 2. Hebrew with Latin translation: *Ruah ha-Hen*, *Physica Hebraea*, Rabbi Aben Tybbon . . . primum edita, et Latina facta. Ioanne Isaac Levita (Coloniae, 1555).

ha-Shamayim ⁸⁶ by Gershon ben Solomon. This passage, as I have shown in the same study of Maimonides on the internal senses, uses the general term "imagination" to include not only the five functions enumerated by Maimonides but also memory, recollection, and appetency. Thus all the internal senses are subsumed under imagination, a view which anticipates the contention which we shall meet with later in Eustachius a Sancto Paulo.⁸⁷

In Hebrew philosophic texts after Maimonides the classifications of internal senses follow one or the other of the several types of classifications which we have discussed, and if any variation from any given type is discovered among them, it can be explained as due to a combination of various types. Thus Isaac Zabara ⁸⁸ and the Zohar ⁸⁹ give a threefold Galenic classification of the internal senses. Shem-Tob Falaquera's classification, on the other hand, is of the Avicennian type,⁹⁰ and one in which common sense and imagination are treated as two distinct faculties. His description of the function of imagination and common sense, furthermore, reflects also the influence of Algazali, especially of the Maḳāṣid al-Falāsifah. Of compositive human and animal imagination he seems to mention only the latter, but this is evidently due to our defective text.⁹¹

The influence of Averroes is discerned in a passage of Sha'ar ha-Shamayim,⁹² where Averroes is referred to several times. Beginning with a statement of the controversy over the question whether the brain is divided into four or three chambers,⁹³

⁸⁶ Sha'ar ha-Shamayim, XII (Rüdelheim, 1801), p. 76.

⁸⁷ Cf. below, Ch. III, n. 59.

⁸⁸ Sefer Sha'ashu'im, IX (ed. I. Davidson), p. 103: (1) דמיון, (2) מחשב, (3) זכרון. Bate ha-Nefesh, *ibid.*, p. 156: (1) דמיון, (2) רעיון, (3) זכרון.

⁸⁹ Idra Rabba, Exodus, Naso, p. 136a: (1) חכמתא, (2) בינה, (3) דעתא. Cf. Kerem Hemed, VIII, 74.

⁹⁰ Sefer ha-Nefesh, Ch. 18 (Warsaw, 1881): (1) המשתתף, (2) המצייר, (3) הדמיון והמצייר, (4) המדמה, (5) השומר והזכור, (6) המחשב, (7) המדמה, (8) המחשב, (9) המדמה.

⁹¹ Text to be corrected to read as follows: [בהקש אל הנפש: ואחרי כן הכח הנקרא מדמה] בהקש אל הנפש האנושית של בעל חיים והוא הנקרא מחשב].

⁹² Sha'ar ha-Shamayim, IX, 49b.

⁹³ A reflection of this controversy is to be found in Al-Razi (*op. cit.*, above, Ch. I, n. 22), who speaks of imagination as residing in the anterior ventricles (plural, not singular) of the brain.

the author proceeds to state that (1) common sense⁹⁴ and (2) retentive imagination are in the anterior two chambers or in the two parts of the single anterior chamber, (3) judgment or cogitation is in the middle chamber, and (4) memory is in the posterior chamber.⁹⁵ This is evidently a combination of Averroes' fourfold philosophical classification, as found in his *De Memoria et Reminiscentia* and *De Anima*, and his threefold physiological classification, as found in his *Colliget*. A similar passage occurs also in Meir Aldabi's *Shebile Emunah*,⁹⁶ where he enumerates four faculties, localizing them in the four chambers of the brain: (1) common sense⁹⁷ in the first chamber, (2) imagination in the second chamber, (3) judgment or intellect in the third chamber, (4) memory in the fourth chamber.⁹⁸ Averroes' enumeration of the five sources of knowledge, in which, as we have seen, the last four correspond to the internal senses, is reproduced by Hillel of Verona,⁹⁹ who refers in this connection to Aristotle's *De Anima* and *De Sensu et Sensibili*¹⁰⁰ (i.e., *Parva Naturalia* and more especially *De Memoria et Reminiscentia*),¹⁰¹ by which, of course, he means Averroes' commentaries on these works. After mentioning the first stage of knowledge, which he terms "corporeal" and "external,"¹⁰² he enumerates the other four stages, which he fails to call "spiritual" and "internal," in the following order: (1) common sense,

⁹⁴ The term "common sense" is not explicitly used here, but it is clear from the context that this is what is meant by the term בהרגש הפנימי. Cf. Aristotle's use of *αἰσθησις* in *Nicomachean Ethics*, VI, 8, 1142a, 27-30, and below, Ch. III, nn. 40, 41. Cf. also Aristotle's use of *αἰσθητικόν* in *De Somniis*, I, 459a, 15-17, quoted above in n. 38.

⁹⁵ (1) הרגש פנימי, (2) מדמה, (3) שופט, (4) זכרון. I take the passage החכם אבן הזה to refer to שופט and not to זכרון which immediately precedes it. The term שופט which is defined by the terms מבחין ומברר is the equivalent of Averroes' בורר, *distinctiva* and hence מחשב, *cogitativa*. Cf. above, notes 73, 77.

⁹⁶ *Shebile Emunah*, IV, 1.

⁹⁷ The term "common sense" is not explicitly used here, but it is clear from the context that this is what is meant by the term כח ההרגש. Cf. above, n. 94.

⁹⁸ (1) כח ההרגש, (2) דמיון, (3) שכל, (4) זכרון. Cf. above, n. 94. As for the term שכל applied here to *διανοητικόν*, it reflects Aristotle's identification of *διανοητικόν* with *νοῦς* in *De Anima*, III, 3, 414b, 18.

⁹⁹ *Tagmule ha-Nefesh* (Lyck, 1874), p. 7a.

¹⁰⁰ אריסטו בספר הנפש ובס' ההרגש והמורגש.

¹⁰¹ Cf. above, n. 72.

¹⁰² חוץ לנפש, גשמית.

(2) *phantasia* and also *aestimativa*,¹⁰³ (3) intellect, (4) memory.¹⁰⁴ His use of *phantasia* and *aestimativa* as two functions of one faculty rather than two distinct faculties corresponds exactly to the view of Averroes.¹⁰⁵ His use of the term "intellect" for what Averroes calls *cogitativa* and *distinctiva* reflects an accurate understanding of what Averroes' *cogitativa* means in contradistinction to the *cogitativa* as used by Avicenna. So does also Aldabi use the terms "judgment" and "intellect," the former reflecting Averroes' *distinctiva*, as does the term "judgment" in Gershon ben Solomon's classification.¹⁰⁶ In another passage, however, Hillel of Verona identifies *cogitativa* with *aestimativa*.¹⁰⁷ This confusion is due to the influence of the Latin scholastic writings, with which he was acquainted and the Latin terms of which he quotes within his Hebrew text. As we shall see in the next chapter, this confusion occurs in Albertus Magnus and others.

¹⁰³ These Latin terms in Hebrew transliteration are used in the text.

¹⁰⁴ (1) חוש משהף, (2) פנטיסיע, דמיונית; שטיאומטיבא, שמאית, (3) משכלת, (4) שומר. The term שמאית is a direct translation of the Latin *aestimativa* and does not occur in the works of earlier authors, who had no knowledge of Latin. For the term משכלת see above, n. 98.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. above, nn. 68-70.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. above, n. 95.

¹⁰⁷ Op. cit., p. 21b: (קווייטאטיבו) מחשבי; (אוטיבו) שמאי.

CHAPTER III

Latin translations of Avicenna's, Algazali's, and Averroes' classifications of the internal senses. — The remarkably careful use of terminology in these translations. — Four types of Avicennian classifications in Albertus Magnus: his discussion of the Averroian classification. — The restatement of the Avicennian and Averroian classifications by Thomas Aquinas: his return to the Augustinian use of the term "internal sense." — Roger Bacon's restatement of the Avicennian classification. — The confusion in the use of the term *cogitativa* by Albertus, Thomas, and Bacon. — General tendencies toward a modification of traditional Arabic classifications in later Latin philosophical texts: Heereboord, Keckermann, Magirus, Zanchius. — The classifications of Eustachius a Sancto Paulo. — Traditional Arabic classifications in early modern philosophy: Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz. — Ultimate return to the Augustinian use of the term "internal sense": Locke, Kant. — Summary.

THROUGH the Latin translations from the Arabic in the 12th and 13th centuries¹ the Avicennian and Averroian classifications of the internal senses became known to the scholastics. In the 12th century Johannes Hispalensis translated from Avicenna's *Al-Shifâ'* the section dealing with the soul, which is generally referred to as "VI de naturalibus" or as "De Anima."² It was probably also Johannes Hispalensis who translated Algazali's *Maḳâṣid al-Falâsifah*, the third part of which, dealing with physics and containing the discussion on the soul, is referred to as "Physica."³ Later in the same century Gerard of Cremona translated Avicenna's *Canon*. In the course of the 13th century Michael Scotus translated Avicenna's *De Animalibus*⁴ and Averroes' *Long Commentary on De Anima*,⁵ as well as his *Epitome of Parva Naturalia*,⁶ and Bonacosa translated (in 1255) Averroes' *Kulliyat* under the title of *Colliget*.⁷ Now, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and Roger

¹ Cf. M. Steinschneider, *Die europäischen Übersetzungen aus dem Arabischen bis Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts* in *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 149 (1904), 151 (1905).

² Cf. above, Ch. II, n. 32, and below, nn. 8, 11, 13.

³ This part of the Latin translation is included in Algazel's *Metaphysics*, ed. J. T. Muckle, Toronto, 1933. Cf. above, Ch. II, n. 45.

⁴ *De Animalibus*, Venice, c. 1500.

⁵ Cf. above, Ch. II, n. 75.

⁶ Cf. above, Ch. II, n. 72.

⁷ Cf. above, Ch. II, n. 82.

Bacon have all drawn extensively upon some or all of these Arabic sources in their discussion of the internal senses. Albertus Magnus mentions Avicenna's "VI de Naturalibus,"⁸ Algazali's "Physica,"⁹ and Averroes' Long Commentary on De Anima and his Epitome of Parva Naturalia.¹⁰ Thomas Aquinas mentions Avicenna's "de Anima" and Averroes' Epitome of Parva Naturalia,¹¹ quotes from Algazali's "Physica,"¹² and evidences a knowledge of Averroes' Long Commentary on De Anima, as we shall show in our discussion of his use of the term *ratio particularis*. Roger Bacon mentions Avicenna's "de Anima"¹³ and "de Animalibus,"¹⁴ and refers also indirectly to his Canon.¹⁵

Of particular interest to us in the study of these translations is the remarkable care and comparative uniformity with which the technical Arabic terms are rendered into Latin. The Arabic term for common sense, being a literal translation of the Greek *κοινὸν αἰσθητήριον*, is uniformly translated by *sensus communis*. The Arabic terms for retentive imagination and compositive animal imagination are two different forms (*Ḥayāliyyah* and *mutahayyilah* respectively) of the same root meaning simply "to imagine" (*ḥāl*). In the Latin translations, these two terms are similarly translated by two different forms of a word meaning simply "imagination," usually one derived from the Greek and the other from the Latin, but sometimes both of them derived from the Latin. Thus in Avicenna's Canon retentive imagination and compositive animal imagination are translated respectively by *phantasia* and *imaginativa*; in Algazali's "Physica" they are translated by *imaginativa* and *phantasia*; and in Avicenna's De Anima they are translated by *imaginatio*

⁸ Summa de Creaturis, Pars II: De Homine (ed. Vivès), Quaest. 35, Art. 3: "Avicenna in VI de Naturalibus."

⁹ Ibid., Quaest. 35, Art. 2: "Algazel in Physica sua."

¹⁰ Liber de Memoria et Reminiscentia, Tract. I, Cap. 1.

¹¹ Summa Theologica, Pars I, Quaest. 78, Art. 4, No. 6: "Avicenna in suo libro de Anima."; De Potentiis Animae, Cap. IV: "Unde Algazel dicit."

¹² De Potentiis Animae, Cap. IV: "ut dicit Averroes in lib. suo de Sensu et Sensato."

¹³ Opus Majus, V: Perspectiva, Pars I, Dist. I, Cap. II.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.: "et in libris medicinae."

and *imaginativa*. For retentive imagination the Arabic uses also another term, *mutaṣawwirah*, which is derived from a root meaning "to form" as well as "to imagine" (*taṣwir*), from which also is derived in Arabic the technical word for form (*ṣûrah*). This is literally translated into Latin by *formalis*, which is used in the sense of imagination. Compositive human imagination, for which the Arabic is *mufakkirah*, is invariably translated by *cogitativa*,¹⁶ and so is the same term translated also in Averroes' works, where it means, as we have seen, "human thought" or "reason." The Arabic *wahm* is invariably translated by *aestimatio* (or *extimatio*). The two Arabic terms for memory, *ḥâfızah* and *dâkirah*, when they are used in the contrasting sense of memory and recollection, are translated respectively either by *conservativa* and *memorialis* (Avicenna, Canon), or by *memorialis* and *reminiscibilis* (Avicenna, De Anima), or by *conservans* and *rememorativa* (Averroes, Parva Naturalia). In Algazali's "Physica," where, as we have shown above, *ḥâfızah* is used in the sense of retentive imagination, it is translated by *retentiva*; *dâkirah*, which is used in the general sense of memory, is translated by *memorialis*.

In the light of these remarks we may now examine the classifications of Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and Roger Bacon.

In Albertus Magnus we have four kinds of classifications of the internal senses.

First, the classification in Isagoge in Libros de Anima, Cap. XIV-XIX, where he quotes Avicenna to the effect that the internal senses are five. They are arranged by him as follows: (1) common sense, identified with phantasia (*phantasia, quae est sensus communis*), (2) retentive imagination (*imaginatio*), (3) compositive animal imagination (*imaginativa*) and compositive human imagination (*cogitativa*),¹⁷ (4) estimation (*aesti-*

¹⁶ In the late Latin translation from the Hebrew of Averroes' Tahâfut al-Tahâfut (see above, Ch. II, nn. 47, 68) the order is reversed: *fikr* is translated by *aestimatio* and *wahm* by *cogitatio* (see above, Ch. II, n. 57). See also a similar mistranslation of *wahm* in Buxtorf, Cuzari, above, Ch. II, nn. 59, 61.

¹⁷ He calls it also *formativa*: "in quantum autem operatur componendo et dividendo, formativa vocatur" (Cap. 16). Cf. above, Ch. II, n. 18.

mativa), (5) memory and recollection (*memorativa, sive memorabilis; reminiscentia*).

Second, the classification in *De Apprehensione, Partes III-IV*, where the classification is as follows: (1) *sensus communis*, (2) retentive imagination (*imaginatio, imaginativa, formalis*),¹⁸ (3) estimation (*aestimativa*), (4) compositive animal imagination (*phantasia*) and compositive human imagination (*excogitativa*), (5) memory and recollection (*memoria, reminiscentia*). A similar classification, with but the omission of compositive human imagination, occurs also in his *De Anima, Lib. III, Tract. I, Cap. IX*.

Third, the classification in *De Anima, Lib. II, Tract. IV, Cap. VII*, which runs as follows: (1) *sensus communis*, (2) retentive imagination (*imaginatio, virtus formalis*), (3) estimation (*aestimatio*), (4) memory (*memoria*), (5) compositive animal imagination (*phantasia*) and compositive human imagination (*cogitativa*).

Fourth, the classification in *Summa de Creaturis, Pars II: De Homine*, where common sense is explicitly placed under the external senses (*Quaest. XIX: De Visu*). The internal senses, assuming that they were meant to be five, are as follows (*Quaest. XXXVII-XLI*): (1) retentive imagination (*potentia imaginativa, virtus formalis et imaginatio*), (2) compositive animal imagination (*phantasia*) and compositive human imagination (*cogitativa*), (3) estimation (*aestimativa*), (4) memory (*memoria*), (5) recollection (*reminiscentia*).

Our earlier analysis of the classifications of Avicenna and Algazali on the basis of their own original writings will throw light on some very important points, which have hitherto been overlooked in these classifications of Albertus. First, it will show that the difference in the order of the arrangement of the individual senses between the *first, second, and fourth* classifications, on the one hand, and the *third* classification, on the other, is not accidental, but is due to a difference in the sources used by Albertus, the former three classifications following the order given in Avicenna's *Al-Shifâ'*, and the latter classification follow-

¹⁸ Also: *species, thesaurus formarum* (cf. above, Ch. II, n. 48).

ing the order given in Algazali's Maḳāṣid al-Falāsifah. Second, it will show that the use of the term *phantasia* in the *first* classification is different from its use in the *second*, *third*, and *fourth* classifications. In the latter three classifications it stands for compositive animal imagination; in the former classification it reflects the Greek word *φαντασία*, which in Avicenna's Al-Shifâ', as we have seen above, is used as synonymous with common sense, even though common sense and retentive imagination are treated as two distinct faculties. Third, it will also explain how it happened that in Albertus' *second*, *third*, and *fourth* classifications, as well as in subsequent Latin literature in general, the term *formalis* came to be used as synonymous with *imaginativa*. Finally, the inclusion of common sense under external senses in Albertus' *fourth* classification, which occurs neither in Avicenna nor in Algazali, may be in part at least due to the influence of Isaac Israeli, who does not place common sense under the internal senses but makes it rather an intermediary between the external and internal senses.¹⁹ This work was translated together with his Liber de Definitionibus either by Constantinus Afer in the 11th century or by Gerard of Cremona in the 12th century. The latter work is explicitly mentioned by Albertus in connection with his discussion of memory.²⁰ It is not quite accurate to say²¹ that in his treatment of common sense as an external sense Albertus has departed from Aristotle, for in Aristotle there is no distinction between external and internal senses, nor is there any indication that common sense would have been placed by him under the latter had he made such a distinction.²²

In Parva Naturalia Albertus Magnus makes three observations on the difference between Avicenna and Averroes in their classifications of the internal senses.

First, he says, Avicenna's *aestimativa* is called by Averroes

¹⁹ Liber de Elementis, II, fol. ix, r, a; Sefer ha-Yesodot, II, 53-54. Cf. my paper Isaac Israeli on the Internal Senses in op. cit.

²⁰ Summa de Creaturis, Pars II: *De Homine*, Quaest. 40, Art. 1.

²¹ Cf. A. Schneider, Die Psychologie Alberts des Grossen, I (1903), 132.

²² In fact, it has been pointed out that the first two chapters of De Anima, III, which deal with common sense, are more closely connected with the discussion of the external senses in Book II. Cf. R. D. Hicks, Aristotle: De Anima, p. 422.

cogitativa animalium brutorum, or *cogitativa brutorum*.²³ Now, Averroes does not explicitly call Avicenna's *aestimativa* by the terms ascribed to him by Albertus. All that we find in Averroes on this point is as follows: (1) a passage in his Epitome of De Memoria et Reminiscentia where he says that a certain act in the process of imagination (*iudicare . . . ista intentio est istius imaginati*) is performed in man by means of cognition (*per cognitionem*) and in animals by nature (*natura*), and that that faculty in animals has no special name, although Avicenna calls it *aestimativa*;²⁴ (2) a passage in his Colliget where he says that *virtus cogitativa* is found only in man and that in beasts its place is taken by *aestimativa*.²⁵ In neither of these passages, it will be noticed, does Averroes use the term *cogitativa brutorum* as the equivalent of Avicenna's *aestimativa*.

Second, in reproducing Averroes' enumeration of the five stages of knowledge, which we have discussed above,²⁶ the last four, which represent the internal senses, are given by Albertus Magnus as follows: (1) *sensus communis*, (2) *imaginatio*, (3) *virtus distincta*, which Averroes calls *cogitativa brutorum*, (4) *memorativa* (also *conservatio*).²⁷ In view of the fact that in this passage, as well as in the previous passage, both *aestimativa* and *distincta* are said by Albertus to have been called *cogitativa brutorum* by Averroes, it is quite clear that he takes the term *distincta* to have the same meaning in Averroes as the term *aestimativa* in Avicenna. But as we have already seen above, *virtus distinctiva* in Averroes is used as synonymous with his own use of *virtus cogitativa* (Arabic: *fikr*), that is to

²³ Liber de Memoria et Reminiscentia, Tract. I, Cap. 1: "et hanc quidem Avicenna bene et proprie vocavit *aestimationem*. Averroes autem improprie vocat *cogitativam animalium brutorum*, per quam fugiunt nociva et persequuntur convenientia." Cf. quotation below in n. 27.

²⁴ Aristotelis omnia quae extant opera. . . . Venetiis, apud Iuntas, VI, Pars 2, fol. 21 G: "ista nam virtus est in homine per cognitionem. . . . Et ista virtus in animalibus non habet nomen: et est illa, quam Avicenna vocat *existimationem*." Cf. above, Ch. I, n. 35, and Ch. II, n. 79.

²⁵ Quoted above in Ch. II, n. 83.

²⁶ Cf. above, Ch. II, nn. 73, 77.

²⁷ Liber de Memoria et Reminiscentia, Tract. I, Cap. 1: "Quartus locus est in organo *virtutis distinctae*, quam vocat Averroes *cogitativam brutorum*."

say, in the sense of human reason or the discriminative function of human reason.²⁸

Third, says Albertus, Avicenna's *virtus formalis vel imaginativa* is called by Averroes *conservans*.²⁹ This reflects the following passage in Averroes: "Et ista virtus [i.e., facere illam imaginem esse praesentem] invenitur duobus modus. Si nam comprehensio eius fuerit continua, dicetur conservans."³⁰ Albertus could have quoted with greater pertinency Algazali, who as we have shown above³¹ either makes conservation take the place of retentive imagination, as he does in *Mizân al-'Amal* and *Tahâfut al-Falâsifah*, or makes conservation and retentive imagination synonymous terms, as he does in *Maqâsid al-Falâsifah*. The first two works, however, were unknown to Albertus, and as for the last-named work, the Latin translation of it, which he did know, does not happen to render the particular passage in question quite accurately, nor does it use the term *conservans* or *conservativa*. In that Latin translation the passage reads as follows: "Imaginativa est virtus retentiva eius quod impressum fuit sensui communi."³² A more accurate translation of the passage would read as follows: "Quod ad virtutem imaginativam pertinet, illud verbum est explicatio de conservantis eius quod impressum fuit sensui communi."³³

While Albertus Magnus in his four kinds of classifications of the internal senses reproduces Avicenna's classification with strict accuracy, no such accuracy is to be found in Thomas Aquinas. Referring specifically to Avicenna's fivefold classification of the internal senses, Thomas enumerates them as follows: (1) *sensus communis*, (2) retentive imagination (*phantasia*), (3) compositive human and animal imagination (*imaginativa*), (4) estimation or cogitation (*aestimativa seu cogitativa*), the former in animals and the latter in man, (5) memory (*me-*

²⁸ Cf. above, Ch. II, nn. 73, 77, 95.

²⁹ *Liber de Memoria et Reminiscentia*, Tract. I, Cap. 1.

³⁰ *De Memoria et Reminiscentia*: Averrois Paraphrasis, in op. cit., fol. 21 FG.

³¹ Cf. above, Ch. II, nn. 48-51.

³² Algazel's *Metaphysics* (ed. J. T. Muckle), p. 170.

³³ وأما القوة المتصورة فعبارة عن الحافظة لما ينطبع في الحس المشترك.

morativa).³⁴ This does not quite accurately represent Avicenna's classification. In Avicenna, as we have seen, *cogitativa* is taken in the sense of compositive human imagination and is correlated with *imaginativa* in the sense of compositive animal imagination. What Thomas really does here is this: He takes *cogitativa* in the Averroian sense of reason in man and correlates it with the Avicennian *aestimativa* in animals. Thomas evidently was not aware of the difference in the use of *cogitativa* by Avicenna and Averroes.

In his restatement of the view of Averroes,³⁵ Thomas Aquinas is correct in his general observation that in Averroes' scheme of classification the five Avicennian senses are reduced to four by the combination of retentive imagination and compositive imagination into one faculty. But he is not quite accurate in his description of the details of the scheme. In the first place, he says that according to Averroes compositive imagination is to be found only in man and not in animals.³⁶ In the second place, he says that according to Averroes *aestimativa* in animals is a distinct faculty corresponding to *cogitativa* in man.³⁷ As we have seen, *aestimativa* in animals, according to Averroes, is a sub-function of imagination together with retentive and compositive imagination. Thomas' unacquaintance with Averroes' view on the faculty of *aestimatio* is explainable on the ground

³⁴ Summa Theologica, Pars I, Quaest. 78, Art. 4, No. 6 and Concl.; De Potentiis Animae, Cap. 4. In No. 6 in Summa Theologica the expression "seu cogitativa" does not occur. That the term *imaginativa* which occurs in this Avicennian list between the terms *phantasia* and *aestimativa* is meant by Thomas to include both compositive human imagination and compositive animal imagination is evident from the following statement in Concl. in Summa Theologica: "Avicenna vero ponit quintam potentiam mediam inter aestimativam et imaginativam (= *phantasiam* in this list), quae componit et dividit formas imaginatas . . . Sed ista operatio non apparet in aliis animalibus ab homine, in quo ad hoc sufficit virtus imaginativa (= *phantasia* in this list)."

³⁵ Summa Theologica, *ibid.*; De Potentiis Animae, *ibid.*

³⁶ Cf. Summa Theologica, *loc. cit.*, Concl.: "Sed ista operatio non apparet in aliis animalibus ab homine, in quo ad hoc sufficit virtus imaginativa. Cui autem hanc actionem attribuit Averroes in libro quodam quem fecit de sensu et sensibilibus." Cf. also De Potentiis Animae, *loc. cit.*

³⁷ Cf. Summa Theologica, *loc. cit.*: "Et ideo quae in aliis animalibus dicitur *aestimativa naturalis*, in homine dicitur *cogitativa*." Cf. also De Potentiis Animae, *loc. cit.* That this view, which Thomas presents as his own, is also meant by him to represent the view of Averroes, is evident from the context.

of the inaccessibility to him of Averroes' *Tahâfut al-Tahâfut*, for that work was not translated into Latin until 1328.³⁸

Thomas himself follows Averroes' classification as he understood it to be. His fourfold classification, therefore, runs as follows: (1) *sensus communis*, (2) imagination (*phantasia, sive imaginatio*), both retentive and compositive, the latter only in man, (3) estimation in animals corresponding to cogitation in men (*aestimativa, cogitativa*), (4) memory (*memorativa*).³⁹ For *aestimativa* Thomas uses in *Summa Theologica*, Pars I, Quaest. LXXVIII, Art. IV, Conclusio, also the term *aestimativa naturalis*. This seems to be a combination of Averroes' *natura* and Avicenna's *aestimatio* (cf. above, Ch. II, nn. 79, 80). For *cogitativa* he also uses in the same work the term *ratio particularis* which he describes in the following words: "Est enim collativa intentionum individualium." This seems to reflect Averroes' term *virtus distinctiva* or *virtus distinctiva individualis* which is used by him as the equivalent of *cogitativa* (cf. above, Ch. II, nn. 73, 77).

Of particular interest is a passage in Thomas which seems to divest the term "internal sense" of its generic meaning as inclusive of several post-sensatory faculties and to identify it with one particular faculty. He identifies it with the term *αἴσθησις*, in which, according to Aristotle, prudence (*φρόνησις*) resides, referring to *Nicomachean Ethics*, VI, 8, 1142a, 27-30.⁴⁰ Inasmuch as by *αἴσθησις* in that passage Aristotle means common sense,⁴¹ Thomas is thus identifying internal sense with common sense, which corresponds to the use made of the term by Augustine.⁴²

Roger Bacon shows an unusual historical sense in his treatment of the internal senses. He knows that Aristotle makes

³⁸ Cf. M. Steinschneider, *Die hebraeischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters*, p. 330.

³⁹ Cf. op. cit., above, n. 34.

⁴⁰ *Summa Theologica*, Secunda Secundae, Quaest. 47, Art. 3: "Ad tertium dicendum, quod sicut Philosophus dicit in 6 Ethic. (cap. 8, ad fin.), prudentia non consistit in sensu exteriori, quo cognoscimus sensibilia propria, sed in sensu interiori, qui perficitur per memoriam, et per experimentum ad prompte judicandum de particularibus expertis."

⁴¹ Cf. A. Grant, *The Ethics of Aristotle*, ad loc. (II, 172, note).

⁴² Cf. above, Ch. I, nn. 12-13.

no mention of all the faculties that go under the name of internal senses, except those of common sense, imagination, and memory.⁴³ He is also conscious of the fact that the Latin translations of Avicenna are likely to lead to a misunderstanding of his views. But when he says that the translators of Avicenna's *De Anima*, *De Animalibus*, and *Canon* have not used a uniform vocabulary,⁴⁴ he is not quite right. As we have shown above, the essential part of the vocabulary is remarkably uniform in all the Latin translations.⁴⁵ He refers especially to a passage in *De Animalibus* in which Avicenna is said by him to state that in brutes the estimative faculty takes the place of reason.⁴⁶ The passage referred to is probably that found in *De Animalibus*, Book XIII, which Roger Bacon quotes verbatim in his *De Multiplicatione Specierum*, Pars III, Cap. II, though he refers to it there as from *De Animalibus*, Book X.⁴⁷ But even without the original Arabic before us, the vocabulary used in that passage does not seem to us to differ from that in the other works of Avicenna.

Bacon's own classification reads as follows: (1) *sensus communis* and *phantasia*, (2) retentive imagination (*imaginatio*), (3) estimation (*aestimativa*), (4) memory (*memorativa*), (5) composite animal and human imagination (*cogitativa*, *logistica*, *rationalis*).⁴⁸ Of this classification Bacon himself says that it is taken from Avicenna's *De Anima*.⁴⁹ But certain differences

⁴³ *Opus Majus*, V: *Perspectiva*, Pars I, Dist. I, Cap. V (ed. J. H. Bridges: *The 'Opus Majus' of Roger Bacon*, II, 9 f.).

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 10: "Et licet translatorez librorum Avicennae, ut in illo libro de Anima et in libro de Animalibus et in libris medicinae, aliter transtulerunt et vocabula mutaverunt, ita ut ubique non sit eadem intentio Avicennae translata."

⁴⁵ Cf. above, p. 115.

⁴⁶ *Loc. cit.*: "quoniam in libro de Animalibus Avicennae reperitur quod aestimatio est loco rationis in brutis." Cf. quotation from Averroes' *Colliget* above, Ch. II, n. 83.

⁴⁷ Printed in J. H. Bridges, *op. cit.*, II, 510: "Avicenna in decimo de Animalibus dicit. . . . Sed imaginatio et aestimatio non sunt cum motu corporis, vel divisione aliqua in corpore." This passage occurs in Lib. XII of the printed edition of *De Animalibus*. It must be admitted that this passage resembles rather remotely his reference to the *De Animalibus* quoted from the *Opus Majus* in the preceding note. But I could not find any closer passage in the entire work.

⁴⁸ *Op. cit.*, Cap. II-V.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, Cap. V, p. 10: "sed tenenda est ejus sententia in libro de Anima, quia ibi ex principali intentione discutit vires animae, alibi autem magis ex incidenti facit mentionem."

are to be noticed between these two classifications. First, they differ in the order of the arrangement of the individual senses, the *fifth* in Bacon's classification being the *third* in Avicenna's *De Anima*. Second, in Avicenna's *De Anima* the term *phantasia* is used as completely synonymous with *sensus communis*; Bacon explains it as a generic term including both (1) *sensus communis* and (2) *imaginatio*.⁵⁰ Third, Avicenna's *De Anima* uses the term *memorialis*; Bacon uses the term *memorativa*. Fourth, and the most important difference, Avicenna's *De Anima* uses two terms, *imaginativa* and *cogitativa*, as designations respectively of compositive animal imagination and compositive human imagination; Bacon uses the term *cogitativa* (and also *logistica* and *rationalis*) for both compositive animal imagination and compositive human imagination.

Of these three philosophers, as we have seen, Albertus Magnus reproduces the classifications of both Avicenna and Averroes quite accurately, but he misunderstands the meaning of Averroes' use of the term *cogitativa* and with it also his use of the term *distinctiva*. Thomas Aquinas' reproduction of Avicenna's classification likewise reveals a misunderstanding of Avicenna's use of the term *cogitativa*; his reproduction of Averroes' classification reveals merely a misplacement of the term *aestimativa*. Roger Bacon does not reproduce Averroes, but his reproduction of Avicenna reveals again a misuse of the term *cogitativa*, though not the same kind of misuse as that of Thomas Aquinas. It will be noticed that these three philosophers have failed to reproduce with accuracy the use of the term *cogitativa* by either Avicenna or Averroes.

The inaccurate reproduction of Averroes' classification by Thomas Aquinas and similarly the inaccurate reproduction of Avicenna's classification by Roger Bacon appear in the works of Latin authors of a later period. Thus, for instance, Heereboord's fourfold classification of the internal senses is nothing

⁵⁰ Ibid., Cap. II, p. 5: "Nam ex secundo de Anima et de Somno et Vigilia et libro de Sensu et Sensato patet quod phantasia et sensus communis sunt idem secundum subjectum, differentes secundum esse, ut Aristoteles dicit, et quod phantasia et imaginatio sunt idem secundum subjectum, differentes secundum esse. Quapropter phantasia comprehendit utramque virtutem, et non differt ab eis nisi sicut totum a parte."

but the Averroian classification as it was understood and adopted by Thomas Aquinas. It reads as follows: (1) *sensus communis*, (2) *phantasia* (including both retentive and compositive imagination), (3) *aestimativa* in animals, corresponding to *cogitativa* in men, (4) *memoria* (and *reminiscentia*).⁵¹ The inaccurate Avicennian classification as given by Roger Bacon seems to be the source of the classifications given by Keckermann,⁵² Magirus,⁵³ and Zanchius.⁵⁴ These three authors, however, do not follow Bacon completely. Evidently taking Bacon's hint that in Aristotle only three internal senses are specifically mentioned, they make these three Aristotelian faculties the basis of their classifications. They all thus start with a threefold classification, namely, (1) *sensus communis*, (2) *imaginatio sive phantasia*, (3) *memoria*. It is to be noted that these threefold classifications are different from the Galenic threefold classification which we have discussed above; they are rather, as we have said, the threefold Aristotelian classifications referred to by Roger Bacon. Then all these three authors proceed to discuss *aestimativa* and *cogitativa*.⁵⁵ Taking these terms in the sense in which they are used in Bacon's fivefold classifications, they reduce them, as does Averroes, to the status of sub-functions of imagination. Their classifications, we may therefore say, begin with Bacon's reproduction of Avicenna's fivefold classification in which the term *cogitativa* is used in the sense of both compositive animal and compositive human imagination. But knowing, as Bacon did, that of these five faculties only three are directly discussed by Aristotle as distinct faculties, and having evidently become acquainted, through the Latin translations of the Tahâfut al-Tahâfut,⁵⁶ with Aver-

⁵¹ Meletamata Philosophica: Philosophia Naturalis, Cap. XIV (Amsterdam, 1680), pp. 900 ff.

⁵² D. B. Keckermann, Opera Omnia: Systema Physicum, Lib. III, Cap. 17-19. Geneva, 1614, I, Col. 1522-1526.

⁵³ J. Magirus, Physiologia Peripatetica, Lib. 6, Cap. 12, Cambridge, 1642, pp. 350 ff.

⁵⁴ H. Zanchius, De Operibus Dei intra Spacium Sex Dierum Creatis Opus, Pars III, Lib. II, Cap. III: De Partibus et Potentiis Animae, De Sensibus Internis. 3rd ed. Neustadii in Palatinatu, 1602, pp. 733-739.

⁵⁵ Keckermann, Col. 1524 EF; Magirus, p. 352, No. 24; Zanchius, p. 736, Col. 2.

⁵⁶ The first translation from the Arabic was made in 1328; the second translation

roes' criticism of Avicenna's views on estimation and compositive animal and human imagination, they return to the original Aristotelian threefold classification, by reducing estimation and compositive human imagination, in accordance with Averroes' criticism of Avicenna, to the status of sub-functions of imagination.

The feeling that the traditional Arabic classifications of the internal senses were too large and that they counted as separate faculties what Aristotle himself would have counted as sub-functions of one faculty is clearly expressed by Eustachius a Sancto Paulo.⁵⁷ Beginning with an enumeration of four internal senses like those in the fourfold classification of Thomas Aquinas, namely, (1) *sensus communis*, (2) *phantasia*, (3) *aestimativa sive cogitativa*, and (4) *memoria*, he then argues in turn: first, for their reduction to three by the identification of *aestimativa sive cogitativa* with *phantasia*; second, for their reduction to two by the identification of *memoria* with *phantasia*, for this, he adds, would agree with the view of Aristotle himself, who in *De Anima* enumerates only *sensus communis* and *phantasia*;⁵⁸ third, for their reduction to one by the identification of *sensus communis* with *phantasia*. The term "internal sense" thus becomes with him identical with "imagination," a view which we also meet with in Hebrew philosophic literature.⁵⁹

The same traditional Arabic use of the term "internal sense" with the tendency of reducing the senses which are included under it to a smaller number, and even to one, which we have already met before, is to be found also in modern philosophy. Descartes, in one place, speaks of two internal senses (*sensus interni*), and describes one of them as consisting of our natural appetites (*appetitus naturalis*) and the other as consisting of

from the Hebrew was published in 1527. Cf. M. Steinschneider, *op. cit.* (above, n. 38), pp. 330, 333.

⁵⁷ Eustachius a Sancto Paulo, *Summa Philosophiae Quadripartita*, III: *Physica*, Pars III, Tract. III, Disp. III, Quaest. 1. Cambridge, 1640, pp. 316-318.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 316: "Probabilior adhuc et magis Aristotelica, Duos duntaxat esse Sensus internos, nempe sensum communem et Phantasiam, cum de illis tantum mentionem faciat in lib. De anima."

⁵⁹ Cf. Ruah Hen, Ch. 2, pp. 18-19 (ed. Coloniae, 1555, with Latin translation by I. I. Levita): וההרוש הפנימי הוא הדמיון, *sensus interior est facultas aestimandi* (= *imaginandi*); Gershon ben Solomon, *Sha'ar ha-Shamayim*, XII: והפנימיות דמיון והוא הכח המדמה.

the emotions of the mind or passions (*animi commotiones, sive pathemata*) and the effects (*affectus*).⁶⁰ This would seem to be a novel use of the term. But in another place, where the term "internal sense" is implicitly understood though not explicitly mentioned, he places under it the faculties of "imagination, memory, etc."⁶¹ In still another place imagination is identified by him with common sense, and the latter is contrasted with the external senses.⁶² All this can be readily recognized as the reduction to a twofold classification, namely, imagination and memory, of the original threefold classification, namely, common sense, imagination, and memory. The latter classification, as will be recalled, is referred to by Roger Bacon and is adopted by Keckermann, Magirus, and Zanchius. Imagination and memory, as I have shown elsewhere, form also a veiled classification of the internal senses in Spinoza.⁶³ Imagination only, however, is identified with internal sense (*sens interne*) by Leibniz,⁶⁴ a view which, as we have seen, has already been suggested by Eustachius a Sancto Paulo. But when Leibniz proceeds to describe imagination, which he identifies with the internal sense, as the place "where the perceptions of the different external senses find themselves united," we readily recognize in this description Aristotle's description of one of the functions of common sense.⁶⁵ What Leibniz, therefore, really does here is not only to identify imagination with common sense, for which he had before him the example of Eustachius a Sancto Paulo and Descartes, but also to define it in terms of common sense. This, as will be recalled, was also done by Avicenna in his *Risâlah fi al-Nafs*.⁶⁶ But evidently unaware of the fact that in his description of imagination he has already indirectly identified it with common sense, Leibniz proceeds to say that

⁶⁰ *Principia Philosophiae*, IV, 190. For another instance of the inclusion of the appetitive faculty among the internal senses, see above, Ch. II, p. 111.

⁶¹ Correspondance, XLVI (Oeuvres, ed. Adam et Tannery, I, p. 263, ll. 6-8).

⁶² *Meditationes*, II (Oeuvres, VII, p. 32, ll. 13-19).

⁶³ Cf. my *The Philosophy of Spinoza*, II, 71 ff.

⁶⁴ *Die philosophischen Schriften von Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz*, ed. C. J. Gerhardt, VI, 501.

⁶⁵ *De Sensu*, 7, 449a, 3 ff. Cf. above, Ch. I, n. 43.

⁶⁶ Cf. above, Ch. II, n. 43.

imagination "comprises at once the notions of the particular senses, which are clear but confused, and the notions of the common sense, which are clear and distinct," thus making "imagination" a more extensive term than "common sense." It will be recalled that Roger Bacon takes the Greek term *phantasia*, which Avicenna in his *De Anima* uses as synonymous with *sensus communis* and as distinct from the Latin term *imaginatio*, and uses it as a more extensive term than *sensus communis* and as including both *sensus communis* and *imaginatio*.⁶⁷ What Leibniz seems to be doing here is again this: he uses the term "imagination" in two senses. First, he uses it in the narrow sense of Roger Bacon's *imaginatio*, which Leibniz probably has reference to when he speaks of "the notions of particular senses, which are clear but confused"; second, he uses it in the wider sense of Roger Bacon's *phantasia*, which, as in Roger Bacon, comprises both *imaginatio*, whose notions Leibniz describes as confused, and *sensus communis*, whose notions he describes as distinct. The power of distinguishing between the impressions of the various senses, as will be recalled, is one of the functions of common sense.⁶⁸ The term "distinct" used here by Leibniz reflects that definition of common sense.

The history of the traditional use of the term "internal sense" winds up in modern philosophy with its restoration by Locke and Kant, perhaps unbeknown to themselves, to the original meaning with which it started its career in Augustine. Locke identifies internal sense with reflection,⁶⁹ which, in its simplest form, means according to him consciousness, or, as he calls it, "perception."⁷⁰ Kant defines internal sense (*innerer Sinn*) as "the perception of our own self and of our inner state,"⁷¹ which again is consciousness. But inasmuch as consciousness is, according to Aristotle, one of the functions of common sense,⁷² Locke's and Kant's identification of the old

⁶⁷ Cf. above, n. 50.

⁶⁸ *De Anima*, III, 2, 426b, 8-427a, 16. Cf. above, Ch. II, n. 29.

⁶⁹ Essay concerning Human Understanding, II, 1, § 4.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, II, 9, §§ 1 ff.

⁷¹ *Kritik der Reinen Vernunft*, Transcendentale Asthetik, § 6.

⁷² *De Anima*, III, 2, 425b, 12 ff.

term "internal sense" with consciousness is really a return to the view of Augustine, who, as we have seen at the very beginning of our discussion, uses the term "internal sense" as identical with what Aristotle calls common sense and who ascribes to it, among other functions, also that of consciousness.⁷³

* * *

Summing up the results of our investigation, we find that the term "internal sense" was at first used in early Latin philosophic texts as a designation of one single post-sensational faculty, either "common sense" in Augustine and Gregory the Great or *διάνοια* in Erigena. Then in Arabic philosophy it was used in five different ways:

I. As a designation of *διάνοια* in Sirr al-Ḥalikah (and similarly in the Syriac *Causa Causarum*).

II. As a designation of three post-sensational faculties, namely, (1) imagination in the most general sense, (2) *fikr* as the equivalent of *διάνοια*, and (3) memory. These three internal senses are raised to five in the *Iḥwân al-Ṣafâ* by the addition either of two new post-sensational faculties from the Stoic list or of two sub-functions of *διάνοια*.

III. As a designation of five post-sensational faculties in Alfarabi arrived at (1) by the addition of *wahm* (*aestimatio*), and (2) by the breaking up of imagination into (a) retentive imagination, (b) compositive animal imagination, and (c) compositive human imagination, the last of which transforms the meaning of the Arabic term *fikr* from *διάνοια* to *φαντασία λογιστική* or *βουλευτική*. But by the combination of the two kinds of compositive imagination into one, the five internal senses are reduced to four.

IV. As a designation of seven post-sensational faculties in Avicenna arrived at by the addition of (1) common sense and (2) recollection to the five of Alfarabi's list. But by various combinations of several of these seven faculties into one, which occur in the writings of Avicenna as well as of his fol-

⁷³ De Libero Arbitrio, II, 4 (Migne, XXXII, Col. 1246).

lowers, these seven internal senses are reduced, as a rule, to five.⁷⁴

V. As a designation of the same seven faculties reduced to four⁷⁵ in Averroes (1) by the combination of *wahm* (*aestimatio*) and the three kinds of imagination into one faculty and (2) by the restoration of the Arabic term *fikr* to its original meaning of *διάνοια*.

In Hebrew philosophic texts, the classification of the internal senses follows the same development as that of the Arabic.

In later Latin philosophic texts, beginning with the translation of the works of Avicenna and Averroes in the 12th century, all the classifications of the internal senses are dominated by the influence of Avicenna and Averroes. But Augustine's use of the term "internal sense" occurs occasionally, and in Locke and Kant it is completely restored.

A table showing at a glance the variety of ways in which Greek terms are translated into Arabic, and from the Arabic into Hebrew and Latin, is given below. Latin terms which are translated from the Arabic indirectly through the Hebrew are marked by asterisks. An asterisk marks also one Hebrew term which was translated from the Latin. The references within the parentheses are to chapters and notes of this paper. Latin terms cited in Chapter III from scholastic writings, though based upon translations from the Arabic, are not included in this table.

<i>φαντασία</i> in its most general sense	<i>phantasia</i> (I, 23)
مصور (II, 73)	خیال (I, 24)
מצויר (I, 23; II, 73)	تحیיל
informatum (I, 23)	דעת (I, 26)
imaginans (II, 73)	רעיון [דמיוני] (I, 27)
[תצויר]	רעיון (I, 27)
ציור (I, 21)	דמיון (I, 27)
[الفنطاسیا]	* <i>cogitatio assimilativa</i> (I,
אלפנטסיא (I, 23)	27)

⁷⁴ For a threefold and fourfold classification of these seven internal senses by Avicenna, see above, Ch. II, p. 99.

⁷⁵ For a threefold classification of these internal senses by Averroes, see above, Ch. II, p. 109.

- *phantasia (I, 27)
 *imaginatio (I, 27)
 *aestimandi (III, 59)
 متخیلة (I, 40)
 מדמה (II, 73, 77, 81)
 imaginativa (II, 73, 77, 81)
- φαντασία, retentive imagination
 مصورة
 informans (II, 42)
 formalis (II, 42)
 متصورة
 מצייר (II, 58)
 יצורי (II, 61)
 imaginativa (II, 58)
 *imaginatrix (II, 61)
 *phantasia (II, 61)
 תסור
 הצטיירות (II, 61)
 *formatio (II, 61)
 متخیلة (II, 26)
 خیال
 דמיון (II, 41)
 phantasia (II, 41)
 imaginatio (II, 42)
 خیالیه
 דמיוני (II, 57)
 *imaginativa (II, 57)
 حافظة
 שומר (II, 58)
 retentiva (II, 58)
 حفظ (II, 51)
- διάνοια, διανοητικόν
 فکر (I, 22, 24)
 רעיון (II, 92)
 שכל (II, 98)
- فكرة
 מחשבה (I, 25)
 תבונה (I, 26)
 تفكر
 מחשבה שכלית (I, 27)
 השתכלות (I, 27)
 *cogitatio intelligibilis (I, 27)
 *cogitatio (I, 27)
 مفكرة
 מחשב (II, 73)
 מחשבי (II, 77, 81)
 משכלת (II, 111)
 cogitativa (II, 73, 77, 81)
 cogitans (II, 73)
- κριτικόν
 ממיז
 בורר (II, 73)
 מברר (II, 95)
 מבחין (II, 77, 95)
 שופט (II, 95, 98)
 distinctiva (II, 73, 77)
 distinguens (II, 73)
- φαντασία λογιστική or βουλευτική,
 compositive human imagination
 فکر
 מחשב (II, 59)
 מחשבה (II, 63)
 *imaginatio (II, 59)
 مفكرة
 מחשב (II, 57)
 חושב (II, 56)
 מחשבי (II, 61)
 cogitativa (II, 41, 42, 58)
 *extimativa (II, 57)

σύνεσις, φρόνησις, πρόνοια, estima-
tive faculty

وهم

רעיון (II, 59)

והם (II, 94)

דמיון (II, 80)

existimatio (II, 80)

*cogitatio (II, 59)

وهمة

מחשב (II, 41, 42, 58)

מחשבי (II, 57)

*שמאי (II, 104, 107)

existimativa (II, 41)

extimativa (II, 42, 58)

aestimativa (II, 41)

*cogitativa (II, 57)

متوهمة

מחשבי (II, 61)

*cogitativa, *cogitatrix (II, 61)

ظن (II, 22, 43, 63)

זמימות (II, 22)

זָמַם (II, 63)

aestimatio (II, 22)

خاطر

רעיון (II, 63)

تخیل

דמיון (II, 71)

virtus imaginativa (II, 71)

φαντασία [συνετή, φρόνημα, προνο-
ητική], compositive animal im-
agination

متخيلة

מדמה (II, 41, 42)

דמיוני (II, 58)

רעיוני (II, 56)

יצרי (II, 61)

imaginativa (II, 41, 42, 57)

phantasia (II, 58)

*reminiscentia (II, 61)

*imaginatrix (II, 61)

تخیل

יצר (II, 59, 61)

*reminiscentia (II, 61)

*phantasia (II, 59)

μνήμη [αἰσθητῶν], memory of sen-
sible objects

ذكر

זכרון (II, 59; I, 23)

memoria (I, 23; II, 59)

ذاكرة

זוכר (II, 56, 58)

memoralis (II, 58)

rememorativa (II, 81)

مذكّرة

זוכר (II, 61)

*memoria (II, 61)

تذكر

זכרון (II, 61)

*memoria (II, 61)

حافضة

שומר (II, 41, 42, 57, 73, 77, 81)

conservativa (II, 41)

conservans (II, 73)

memoralis (II, 42)

rememorativa (II, 77, 81)

μνήμη [νοητῶν], memory of intelli-
gible notions

فهم

בינה (I, 25)

حكمة

חכמה (I, 26)

תִּפְתָּח

חבונה (I, 27)

התבוננות (I, 27)

*intellectus (I, 27)

*intelligentia (I, 27)

*intellectio (I, 27)

ἀνάμνησις, recollection

זִכְרוֹנָה

זוכר (II, 41)

memorialis (II, 41)

זִכְרוֹנָה

זוכר (II, 57)

reminiscibilis (II, 42)

memorans (II, 73)

rememorativa (II, 73)

*memorativa (II, 57)

מִזְכָּר (II, 43)

THE TEXT OF THE BIBLE AND THE SCRIPT AND ART OF TOURS

LESLIE WEBBER JONES

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

I. INTRODUCTION: THE SCRIPT AND ART OF TOURS ¹

'To no student of the Middle Ages,' says Beeson,² 'can Tours and its scriptoria fail to appeal.' The historian, for example, desires to know the part Alcuin played in the reform of writing, the relationship between the scriptoria and the Court and Church, the exact dates at which certain monks lived and wrote. The scholar interested in Classical and mediaeval literature turns to manuscripts of Cicero, Virgil, and Livy, or Augustine, Bede, and Isidore. The philologist looks for 'Irish' or 'Spanish' symptoms in the Latinity of certain codices. The theologian

¹ I present a list of abbreviations used hereafter for books and articles frequently mentioned:

Köhler, Schule.

Wilhelm Köhler, *Die Karolingischen Miniaturen. Im Auftrage des Deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft. Erster Band: Die Schule von Tours. Des Textes erster Teil: Die Ornamentik* (Berlin, 1930).

(Köhler,) G. G. A.

—, review of Rand, *Survey* (see below), in *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 193. Jahrgang (1931), 321-336.

Rand, *Survey*.

E. K. Rand, *A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours. Studies in the Script of Tours, I.* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1929).

(Rand,) G. G. A.

—, review of Köhler, *Schule* (see above), in *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 193. Jahrgang (1931), 336-351.

'Alcuin's Bible.'

—, 'A Preliminary Study of Alcuin's Bible,' in *The Harvard Theological Review*, XXIV (1931), 323-396.

The Earliest Book of Tours.

—, with the assistance of Leslie Webber Jones, *The Earliest Book of Tours with Supplementary Descriptions of Other Manuscripts of Tours. Studies in the Script of Tours, II.* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1934).

² C. H. Beeson, in *Classical Philology*, XXV (1930), 285.

consults the numerous excellent Bibles, Gospel Books, and works of the Fathers of the Church. The critic of texts is pleased to find much material at his disposal, particularly for a study of the Bible, but also for Classical and mediaeval works in general. The historian of art delights in the sumptuousness and beauty of such books as the Gospels of Lothaire or the Gospels of Prüm or the First Bible of Charles the Bald (the Vivian Bible). The palaeographer, finally, fairly glows with enthusiasm in studying a script which in the ninth century reached 'a level of calligraphic art unsurpassed . . . in the annals of writing,'³ which won its way within a generation over most of the national hands of Europe to last for several centuries, and which, after a period of dominance by Gothic script, was revived by the Italian humanists to become the basis of our present printer's type.

Our knowledge of Tours in the Middle Ages depends largely upon the information that can be gleaned from its manuscripts. These manuscripts, fortunately, have of late been carefully, though by no means exhaustively, studied by two scholars with different points of view — Rand,⁴ whose main interest is the script, and Köhler,⁵ who centers his attention upon the illumination. So far as the main outlines of the history of the script and illumination go, the results of both investigators agree surprisingly well, especially when one considers the divergent methods of approach and the essentially difficult nature of the work. There are, however, a number of important manuscripts about which they fail to agree.⁶

That both authors sincerely believe in the superiority of their respective 'disciplines' there is no doubt. Köhler points out:⁷ (1) that the script of Tours reaches its high point early in the ninth century and thereafter shows no orderly progress toward a goal, whereas the illumination shows a continuous

³ E. A. Lowe, 'Handwriting,' in C. G. Crump and E. F. Jacob, *The Legacy of the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1926), 217.

⁴ Survey.

⁵ Schule.

⁶ For the points of agreement and disagreement see Köhler, G. G. A.; Rand, G. G. A.; and 'Alcuin's Bible.'

⁷ G. G. A., p. 333.

development throughout the century; (2) that palaeography employs a 'quantitativ-statistisch' method and attempts to force bits of information into pigeon-holes created according to the knowledge of earlier manuscripts in any given case;⁸ (3) that letters of the alphabet, since they are conventional phonetic symbols, are capable of much less variation than the elements used in illumination;⁹ and, finally, (4) that there are relatively many scribes of many different ages and abilities and at least two different types of writing, whereas the number of illuminators is relatively small and consequently the possibility of individual variation considerably reduced.¹⁰ Rand, on the other hand, holds: (1) that, so far as illumination goes, scribe and artist are dealing with the same data;¹¹ (2) that the palaeographer, therefore, has an obvious advantage over the historian of art, since the former's material in any given manuscript is far more plentiful, appearing as it does in every page, whereas ornamental letters, even if they are numerous in a manuscript, may not represent the entire alphabet or exemplify all the styles an artist has at his command;¹² (3) that 'the entire material for constructing the history of illumination at Tours at the end of the eighth century and during the ninth is included in not over seventy-five books, in some of which only a few pages or initials may be illuminated,' whereas with certain exclusions we have left for this same period 'about one hundred more manuscripts than those that were important for Köhler' and 'in them, moreover, every page contributes significant testimony';¹³ and, finally, (4) that 'it is easier for an imitator, if he is a skilful artist, to reproduce the designs in a big initial than to write a page of script in which all the details correspond to the original.'¹⁴

The reader will be amused at this seemingly irreconcilable

⁸ Ditto.

⁹ G. G. A., p. 334.

¹⁰ G. G. A., pp. 335-336.

¹¹ G. G. A., p. 347. Cf., e.g.: 'In some cases it is hard to tell the difference between a letter, or a fragment of text, and a picture; but if lettering underlies the art, however elaborate the art may be, it is a scribe who achieves it.'

¹² G. G. A., p. 348.

¹³ G. G. A., p. 349.

¹⁴ G. G. A., pp. 349-350.

opposition between the historian of art and the palaeographer. That there is at least some truth on each side is undeniable. The reader can decide for himself on which side he believes most of it to be. One fact, however, is certain, namely, that the historian of art and the palaeographer must hereafter work side by side and not independently.¹⁵ With this idea both Köhler¹⁶ and Rand¹⁷ are in full agreement.

If I may express my personal conviction concerning the issues at stake between Köhler and Rand, I believe that the former has one essential fault.¹⁸ He proceeds, on the whole, as if he were treating *all* the material that was ever produced at Tours within the dates set by his study. He then arranges his specimens in a chronological order according to the elaborateness of their art and credits a certain manuscript with the invention of a detail in the design which has not appeared before. No one can deny the logic of his conclusions, but they are based, I feel, on material too scanty to bring accurate results. It is his scientific reserve which causes him to select for treatment only manuscripts which he feels were pretty certainly written at Tours,¹⁹ but one wishes that he would also give more consideration than he does to the art which preceded²⁰ and accompanied²¹ that of Tours at other centers.

It becomes increasingly apparent that in a complicated study

¹⁵ For an application of this principle to another problem see L. W. Jones and C. R. Morey, *The Miniatures of the Manuscripts of Terence prior to the Thirteenth Century* (Princeton: 1930 and 1932).

¹⁶ *G. G. A.*, p. 336.

¹⁷ *G. G. A.*, p. 351, n. 2.

¹⁸ Rand, *G. G. A.*, pp. 350-351; 'Alcuin's Bible,' pp. 341, 346, 347, 353, 373, 393, 395-396; *The Earliest Book of Tours*, p. viii.

¹⁹ He does, however, bar a book (*Survey*, No. 44) that formerly was the keystone in the arch of his account of the Alcuinian style, and on the contrary accepts as books of Tours manuscripts that Rand considers of questionable genuineness (*Survey*, Nos. 33, 95).

²⁰ For a study of some of the foundations upon which Alcuin built see *The Earliest Book of Tours*.

²¹ Cf., e.g., the importance of studying the appearance of imitations of the various styles of Tours at other centers as a means of dating the styles at Tours itself. On this point see E. K. Rand, 'A Supplement on Dodaldus,' *Speculum*, VI (1931), 594, and L. W. Jones, 'Two Salzburg Manuscripts and the Influence of Tours,' *Speculum*, X (1935), July.

such as that of the manuscripts of Tours one needs to employ every method of approach possible. Of this fact Köhler and Rand are both well aware. Both ²² make use, not merely of script and of art, but also of contemporary history, and of the text contained in the manuscripts. It is the latter, however, which has been least adequately treated and which, therefore, gives most promise for the future. Köhler of course does not attempt a definitive estimate, but merely a 'Kontrolmittel.' ²³ Before Köhler's time Corssen ²⁴ had collated 202 passages in *Matthew*, *Mark*, and *Luke* for forty manuscripts (seventeen of Tours) of the ninth century. Köhler ²⁵ accepts his collations for the manuscripts of Tours, and adds the readings (in the 202 passages cited) of twelve others from the same source. ²⁶ As Dom de Bruyne points out in a series of keen observations on the Bible of Tours, ²⁷ Corssen's work was made before the publication of the Gospels by Wordsworth and White ²⁸ and one could consequently make a more judicious choice of variants to-day. One should add to Dom de Bruyne's remarks the fact that a number of the variants in Corssen's list, while significant for the latter's purposes, have no importance whatever for Köhler's problem. The result is that only about one-half of the 202 readings furnish information important in distinguishing the different varieties of the Alcuinian text. As Rand states, however, ²⁹ '... we have something to start with — a useful criterion so far as it goes, and more exact than Berger's

²² Rand avoids a consideration of text in *Survey*, but includes it in 'Alcuin's Bible,' 373-393 (he adds the readings of *Morgan Library* 191 and *Tours, Bib. Municipale*, 22 to Köhler's list). For Köhler's treatment of text see the description below.

²³ Schule, p. 314.

²⁴ Die Trierer Ada-Handschrift, bearbeitet und herausgegeben von K. Menzel, P. Corssen, H. Janitschek, A. Schnütgen, F. Hettner, K. Lamprecht. Publikationen der Gesellschaft für Rheinische Geschichtskunde (Leipzig, 1889), 29-61.

²⁵ Schule, pp. 338-361.

²⁶ Köhler also considers the order of the books of the Bible (Schule, pp. 315-318), the prefatory pieces (Schule, pp. 318-323), the capitula and the divisions in the text (Schule, pp. 323-338). These matters will be discussed below (pp. 143-149).

²⁷ Dom de Bruyne, 'Notes sur la Bible de Tours au IX^e siècle,' in *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 193. Jahrgang (1931), 357.

²⁸ *Novum Testamentum* . . . (Oxonii, 1889-1898).

²⁹ 'Alcuin's Bible,' p. 382.

numerical lists³⁰ or the discoveries by the *règle de fer* of Dom Quentin.³¹ But it is obvious that collations more complete of Bibles and Gospel Books of Tours can hardly fail to cast further light on the present obscure situation.³² This is certainly the most promising field for immediate investigation.

II. THE IMMEDIATE PROBLEM: PARIS, B. N., LAT. 8847

In an interesting review³³ of Köhler's work on the illumination of Tours the Swedish historian of art Carl Nordenfalk has brought forward a new manuscript, *Paris, B. N., lat. 8847*, which he believes was a predecessor at Tours of the St. Gall Bible. The importance of this discovery, if it be true, is obviously great. Nordenfalk reminds us³⁴ that, according to Köhler, the St. Gall Bible (which the latter dates 801 or later) is the earliest certain monument containing examples of the illumination of Tours.³⁵ We have, however, he continues,³⁶ absolutely no idea of the kind of illumination practised at Tours before Alcuin's time. If this manuscript is pre-Alcuinian, it is of first importance not merely for the art,³⁷ but also for

³⁰ S. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1893), p. 241.

³¹ Dom H. Quentin, *Mémoire sur l'Établissement du Texte de la Vulgate*. *Collectanea Biblica Latina*, VI (Rome and Paris, 1922). See E. K. Rand's criticism of this work in *The Harvard Theological Review*, XVII (1924), 197-264.

³² Dom de Bruyne, *loc. cit.*, makes the following excellent suggestion: 'Enfin on s'étonne que personne n'ait encore songé à comparer les mss de Tours avec le commentaire d'Alcuin sur S. Jean. Le commentaire a été fait immédiatement après la revision de la Bible et il est donc un excellent critère pour apprécier le texte de nos mss.'

³³ 'Methodische Fortschritte und Materieller Landerwerb in der Kunstforschung,' in *Acta Archaeologica*, III (1932), 276-288 (with two plates).

³⁴ *Art. cit.*, p. 280.

³⁵ Nordenfalk would really prefer to regard *Paris, B. N., lat. 1451* (dated 796) as 'den besten chronologischen Anhaltspunkt' (p. 279). This ms., however, though retained by Dom A. Wilmart, 'Dodaldus, clerc et scribe de Saint-Martin de Tours,' *Speculum*, VI (1931), 574, n. 2, is discarded by Köhler and by Rand, 'A Supplement on Dodaldus,' *Speculum*, VI (1931), 592 sq.

Again, Nordenfalk (*art. cit.*, p. 280, n. 3) does not seem to accept the early date of Rand's pre-Alcuinian ('Improved Cursive') period. He thinks that Rand has recanted and placed it *after* Alcuin's revision of the text (801), i.e., 'weit ins IX Jahrhundert,' though Rand has done nothing of the sort.

³⁶ *Loc. cit.*

³⁷ *Art. cit.*, p. 280.

the text.³⁸ Many a palaeographer and many a historian of art would be glad to know one of the immediate sources of the art of Alcuin's time; an equal number of students of the text of the Bible would be glad to know the exact nature of the text at Tours which preceded Alcuin's revision (801). On the other hand, if the manuscript is Alcuinian or post-Alcuinian, the art (a supposed 'Vorstufe') must then somehow or other be fitted into the chain of later development and the intricately orderly progress of Köhler's scheme must be amended. Here, then, is a problem of first importance.

There seems to be no doubt of the fact that *Paris, B. N., lat. 8847* is a product of Tours. Nordenfalk points out³⁹ that it employs the Tours half-uncial and is close to the St. Gall Bible and related manuscripts in art.⁴⁰ Rand, with whom I heartily agree, accepts it as a product of Tours, and feels, as does Dom Wilmart, who called Rand's attention to the book, that the script in general is about of the sort of the Bible of Monza⁴¹ (the date of which, according to Rand,⁴² is about 810-820). Even in the absence of a published statement on the matter by Köhler I think we are on absolutely safe ground in considering our manuscript as a book of Tours.⁴³

The reader has already seen above that art and script do not agree in fixing the date of *Paris, B. N., lat. 8847*. Here, then, is an excellent chance to apply the study of the text as a cri-

³⁸ *Art. cit.*, p. 284.

³⁹ *Art. cit.*, pp. 282-284.

⁴⁰ He finds, however (*art. cit.*, p. 282) that it differs from mss. of Tours in that it changes the body and interlacings of the bird-initials of its prototype into a snake ('Schlange'). This would of course be accounted for by supposing our ms. pre-Alcuinian. As a further evidence of the same date he points out (p. 284) that it is the second volume of a two-volume Bible, whereas the St. Gall Bible (which is the earliest to show Alcuin's revision) is in one volume, and Alcuin's letter written to accompany the Alcuinian edition remarks as notable the fact that the edition is in one volume. Nordenfalk, however, fails to point out that some of the Bibles of Tours which belong to the Alcuinian recension are in two volumes: Survey, No. 49 (*London, B. M., Harley 2805*), the first half of a Bible; No. 70 (*Angers, Bib. Mun. 1-2*), two parts of one Bible, written possibly at Angers; No. 73 (*Berne, Stadtbib. 3-4*), two parts of one Bible.

⁴¹ In *The Earliest Book of Tours*, p. 96. See also Plates LIX-LXI.

⁴² Survey, p. 107.

⁴³ That this conclusion is correct is also substantiated by the adherence of the text to the Alcuinian revision. See below, pp. 166, 173-175.

terion. As Nordenfalk states,⁴⁴ 'Das entscheidende Wort muss wohl einer Textkollation vorbehalten bleiben.'

III. THE METHOD OF PROCEDURE

In the pages which follow I present results based on a personal collation of the entire Gospels of three manuscripts. I have chosen the Gospels in their entirety as the largest section of the text which could be chosen for Bibles and Gospel Books in common. It would be still better if we had complete collations of whole Bibles, but my collation at least provides us with much more material and material more useful than that contained in the 202 variants reported by Corsen and Köhler.⁴⁵ The manuscripts collated include not merely *Paris, B. N., lat. 8847* (= *P*₈), whose date we desire to discover, but also *New York, Morgan Library 191* (= *Mor*) and *Paris, B. N., lat. 3* (= *P*₃).⁴⁶ *Morgan 191* will be used as an example of the original text of Alcuin's edition of the Bible.⁴⁷ (I shall follow Rand in calling this text A. T.)⁴⁸ *Paris, B. N., lat. 3*, on the other hand, will be used as an example of the first *revision* of the original Alcuinian edition⁴⁹ (Rand's N. E.).⁵⁰

These two manuscripts are both extremely careful in their readings and the number of actual individual errors is, therefore, very small. Both, moreover, are perhaps as good representatives of their respective families as one might find. Occasionally, of course, the readings of these two manuscripts may *not* be representative of A. T. and N. E. respectively; that is a question which can be answered in all its minor de-

⁴⁴ *Art. cit.*, p. 284.

⁴⁵ See above, p. 139.

⁴⁶ I desire to express my gratitude to Monsieur Ph. Lauer, Conservateur des Manuscrits at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, and to Mr. Morgan, his librarian Miss Belle da Costa Greene, and Miss Meta P. Haarsen also of his library, for their permission to consult these manuscripts and their kindness in facilitating my work.

⁴⁷ As Rand points out, 'Alcuin's Bible,' p. 386, the Morgan Gospels in both earlier and later parts is A. T. in all of the readings listed by Köhler. See Rand's account of this manuscript, *art. cit.*, pp. 351-352, and Köhler's account, *Schule*, p. 161.

⁴⁸ *Art. cit.*, p. 383.

⁴⁹ This ms. (Rand, *art. cit.*, p. 395, and Köhler, *Schule*, p. 339) is certainly N. E.

⁵⁰ *Art. cit.*, p. 383.

tails only by a collation of further codices. In my report of the variants, though I have made *complete* collations for the Gospels, I present only the variants which seem to me to be of significance. Even this selection provides us with a rather lengthy list. I should have attempted to abbreviate it still further, had I not felt that only in its present form would it expedite the comparison by subsequent investigators of the variants which I report with the corresponding readings of other books of Tours in the endeavor to establish date and provenience with greater certainty. A less complete selection of readings would be of little use: in collations a single variant may change the whole story. While I have doubtless made numerous mistakes both of commission and omission,⁵¹ I believe that my report is certainly sufficiently accurate to provide a good picture of N. E., of A. T., and of the character of *Paris, B. N., lat. 8847*.

Before actually reporting the variants in the manuscripts I shall discuss (1) the number and order of the seven prefatory pieces, and (2) the titles in the capitula for each of the Gospels and the number of items in the capitula in relation to the number of divisions in the text itself. These, as Köhler has made clear,⁵² are important criteria, the second more important than the first.

⁵¹ I have intentionally omitted from my report of *Paris, B. N., lat. 8847*, as of no significance, certain misspellings, the omissions of certain unimportant words (particularly *et* at the beginning of clauses, though this is sometimes significant, as we shall see), and certain inversions (corrected frequently by m. 1). In general, the manuscript is much more faulty in text than either of the other two manuscripts. In some instances my judgment will probably prove to be wrong, but I doubt if these instances will affect the general picture. The way of the critic of text is a hard one, beset by pitfalls at every hand, but traversed it must be.

⁵² Schule, p. 315. I omit consideration of one of Köhler's criteria, the order of the books of the Bible, which in the present case is of no significance.

IV. THE EVIDENCE ⁵³A. *The Prefatory Pieces*

The order of the prefatory pieces usually placed before *Matthew* at the beginning of the New Testament is as follows:

<i>Mor</i>	<i>P₃</i>	<i>P₈</i>
1. <i>Novum opus</i>	1. <i>Novum opus</i>	1. <i>Novum opus</i>
2. <i>Sciendum tamen</i> ⁵⁴	2. <i>Sciendum etiam</i>	2. <i>Sciendum tamen</i> ⁵⁴ (3. Canon tables)
3. <i>Plures fuisse</i>	3. <i>Plures fuisse</i>	4. <i>Plures fuisse</i>
4. Letter of Eusebius to Carpianus		
(5. Canon tables)	(4. Canon tables)	

One notes immediately in *P₈* the unusual position of the canon tables and the omission of the Letter of Eusebius to Carpius (beginning *Ammonius quidem*) which contains important matter concerning the canon tables. The first is difficult to explain. It may be due to blind dependence upon a model in which the canon tables had been incorrectly placed. In any case, it apparently has no significance. The omission of the letter, however, is another matter. Köhler ⁵⁵ regards it as a mark of primitiveness. But as Rand points out, ⁵⁶ 'the writer of the prefatory material might naturally leave it for the maker of the canon tables to include as part of his work. The latter, concerned first of all with the tables, might have thought it belonged to the writer of the other prefatory material, or have meant to include it after finishing the tables themselves, but have neglected to do so.' If one be tempted to consider its omission a sign of primitiveness, one should note the phenomenon in *P₃* also, as well as in such books as the Grandval Bible, the Rorigo Bible, and the Basel Gospels, all of which are relatively late. Again, the piece is included in at least one Alcuin-

⁵³ The fact that a Bible is written in one or in two volumes has already been considered (see above, p. 141, n. 40) for its possible bearing upon date.

⁵⁴ *tamen* is merely a variant of *etiam*.

⁵⁵ Schulte, p. 319.

⁵⁶ 'Alcuin's Bible,' p. 377. Cf. his further remarks, *loc. cit.*, on the same subject.

ian (i.e., 'early') book (*London, B. M., Harley 2790*) and may well have appeared upon a leaf now torn out just before the canon tables in a second Alcuinian book (*Paris, B. N., lat. 260*).⁵⁷ The proper explanation seems to be that the piece was probably a part of Alcuin's recension, but accidentally omitted by various manuscripts at various times. The prefatory pieces, then, fail to provide us with a clue as to the date of *P*₈.

B. Capitula

Directly before or after ⁵⁸ each of the prologues or introductions to *Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John* respectively there ordinarily appear in manuscripts of Tours lists of the contents of the sections or chapters of the text (*capitula*). They are omitted in *P*₈. It is interesting to note in this connection that the *capitula* are omitted in some of the books (but not in *Paris, B. N., lat. 260*) regarded by Köhler as the earliest, whereas Berger⁵⁹ and Rand⁶⁰ feel that the *capitula* can hardly have been neglected by Alcuin. The facts can be properly explained, I believe, in at least three ways: first, the omission may be the mark of a pre-Alcuinian book; or, second, it may be due to the conscious omission in an Alcuinian book in which the number of titles in the *capitula* did not accord with the actual numbering of the sections in the text; or, third, it may be due to sheer neglect of what seemed a luxury. The omission is certainly not a promising criterion.

Fortunately, however, *P*₈, though without *capitula*, has divisions indicated in its text throughout. These divisions are certainly worthy of our attention, for by noting their number we may decide with some accuracy the group or groups to which they belong. In this whole matter the reader is referred not merely to Beissel,⁶¹ Köhler⁶² (who follows Beissel's nomen-

⁵⁷ 'Alcuin's Bible,' p. 377.

⁵⁸ After the prologues in *Mor* and *P*₃.

⁵⁹ S. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1893), p. 307.

⁶⁰ 'Alcuin's Bible,' p. 378.

⁶¹ Stephan Beissel, *Geschichte der Evangelienbücher in der ersten Hälfte des Mittelalters. Ergänzungshefte zu den "Stimmen aus Maria-Laach,"* Heft 92 und 93 (Freiburg, 1906), pp. 334-335.

⁶² Schule, pp. 323-335.

clature), and Rand,⁶³ but also to the illuminating remarks of Dom de Bruyne,⁶⁴ from whom we may some day expect a complete treatment of the subject. Dom de Bruyne first of all provides us with a brief historical introduction.⁶⁵ Jerome's text (the Vulgate) had no summaries (capitula) for the Gospels; whenever a need was felt for this convenient method of orientation, one of two things happened: either (1) application was made to ancient summaries which had been based on entirely different texts, or (2) new summaries based on the Vulgate were created. There are consequently many different capitula to be found in manuscripts of Tours. Dom de Bruyne now arranges them in orderly fashion, describes their initial words and the number of items in the list in each case, and, where possible, indicates their origin and history.⁶⁶ The reader will need to consult this description at once.

I present below a statement and discussion of the number of divisions indicated in the text of P_8 as compared with the number of divisions and of capitula in Mor and in P_3 . The letters not in parentheses after the numeral in each instance are the symbols applied by Dom de Bruyne to a particular group of capitula. The additional letters which stand within the parentheses in each case are the symbols of Beissel.

<i>Matthew:</i>	<i>Mor</i>	P_3	P_8
Capitula: 77 = S (f).		81 = R (b).	None.
Divisions: 77.		81.	88 = N.

P_8 's divisions belong to the class which 'apparaît d'abord en Northumbrie.'⁶⁷ There are exactly the same number of items (88) in the Codex Amiatinus, the Gospel Fragment from Utrecht, the Lindisfarne Gospels,⁶⁸ and in the text of *Basel B*.

⁶³ 'Alcuin's Bible,' pp. 378-381.

⁶⁴ 'Notes sur la Bible de Tours au IX^e siècle,' Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen, 193. Jahrgang (1931), pp. 354-357. He points out, moreover, *art. cit.*, p. 355, n. 2, 'Berger 353 énumère un grand nombre de sommaires en indiquant les mss où ils se trouvent. Ces listes sont cependant encore incomplètes. Le tableau de Beissel ne mérite pas les éloges que lui donne trop généreusement Köhler 323. Wordsworth a édité beaucoup de sommaires, mais n'a pas tenté de donner un texte critique.'

⁶⁵ P. 355, particularly n. 1.

⁶⁶ Pp. 355-357.

⁶⁷ Dom de Bruyne, *art. cit.*, p. 356.

⁶⁸ Köhler, Schule, p. 333.

II. 11, which, however, has only 80 items in the capitula.⁶⁹ The last manuscript belongs to the early stage (Köhler's Stufe I) of the Alcuinian Bible. It seems clear, then, that the number 88 is certainly either pre-Alcuinian or early Alcuinian.

<i>Mark:</i>	<i>Mor</i>	<i>P₃</i>	<i>P₈</i>
Capitula:	46 = R (n).	46 = R (n).	None.
Divisions:	46 = R (n). ⁷⁰	46 = R (n). ⁷⁰	46 = ?

For which set of capitula are *P₈*'s divisions intended: R (n), or J (*l*), or N, all of which have 46 items? Since the divisions do not generally correspond with those of *Mor* or of *P₃*, they are presumably not representative of R (n), but instead of either J (*l*), which 'domine en Irlande,'⁷¹ and is very early Alcuinian,⁷² or of N, the set which appeared in *Matthew*.

<i>Luke:</i>	<i>Mor</i>	<i>P₃</i>	<i>P₈</i>
Capitula:	73 = R (G).	73 = R (G).	None.
Divisions:	73 = R (G).	73 = R (G).	92 = N.

The divisions in *Mor* and *P₃* coincide exactly.⁷³ *P₈*'s wholly different set is obviously to be referred to N again, which, it is to be noted, normally has 94 items. There are traces of a set employing 94 items in the Codex Amiatinus, the Lindisfarne Gospels,⁷⁴ and the St. Gall Bible.⁷⁵

<i>John:</i>	<i>Mor</i>	<i>P₃</i>	<i>P₈</i>
Capitula:	35 = R (Q).	35 = R (Q).	None.
Divisions:	35 = R (Q). ⁷⁶	35 = R (Q).	46 = N.

⁶⁹ Köhler, Schule, p. 329.

⁷⁰ Presumably R (n), though J (*l*) also has 46 items. Except for a few readily explicable variations the divisions in *Mor* and *P₃* occur at exactly the same points in the text: the system in the two books is obviously the same.

⁷¹ Dom de Bruyne, *art. cit.*, p. 355.

⁷² Köhler, Schule, p. 329.

⁷³ The only instance of divergence (II at Ch. I, 26 in *Mor* and at Ch. II in *P₃*) is pretty surely accidental.

⁷⁴ Köhler, Schule, p. 326.

⁷⁵ Köhler, Schule, p. 327. There are also traces of another set here employing 78 items.

⁷⁶ Presumably R (Q), though J (*l*) has only one more item and might therefore be confused with the former.

Again, the divisions in *Mor* and P_3 coincide exactly.⁷⁷ The 46 items of P_8 are pretty certainly to be referred, again, to N, which normally has one item less. To be noted in this connection is the fact that there are 46 items in the St. Gall Bible, and 45 in the Codex Amiatinus and the Lindisfarne Gospels.⁷⁸

Let us now sum up the findings in P_8 for the four Gospels. In three of them it is fairly certain that the divisions in the text are to be ultimately derived from a Northumbrian (N) source; in the fourth (*Mark*), the divisions are either from the same source or from another which predominated in Irish books and which is apparently taken over by very early Alcuinian books (J, l). This is a state of affairs easily to be explained if we assume that our manuscript is pre-Alcuinian. Other possible explanations, however, also suggest themselves. For example, our manuscript may have inherited its divisions, either directly or through one or two intermediaries, from some pre-Alcuinian manuscript. P_8 's immediate model, or some earlier ancestor, though it perhaps adopted the new capitula of the Alcuinian revision, may have failed to adopt the Alcuinian system of divisions in the text. Now we do not know exactly how these new divisions were indicated in the manuscript in which the Alcuinian recension was originally noted, but they may well have been set down in the margins (as were certainly the new readings of the Alcuinian recension of the text)⁷⁹ alongside the old divisions. In such an event a scribe copying this revised manuscript may easily have retained the old system of divisions, because of either carelessness,⁸⁰ or conservatism,⁸¹ or failure to decide in his own mind which set was intended.⁸² Certain it is that the general tradition of the capitula and of

⁷⁷ There is one instance of divergence, fairly surely accidental: XXXV at Ch. XX, 19 in *Mor* and at Ch. XX, 1 in P_8 .

⁷⁸ Köhler, Schule, p. 327.

⁷⁹ 'Alcuin's Bible,' p. 391.

⁸⁰ For neglect in this matter cf. the Bible of Monza, 'Alcuin's Bible,' p. 380.

⁸¹ If there was not some conservatism in the copying of Bibles, why were the Alcuinian and subsequent revisions not adopted almost immediately in their entirety?

⁸² After all, two sets of numbers afford little basis for choice, especially if one set is not crossed out or expunged.

the divisions is a considerably confused affair.⁸³ Again, it is particularly to be noted that P_8 has no capitula. If this were true of its model also, why should the scribe of P_8 , copying that model, have tried to change the only system of divisions before him? These explanations by no means exhaust the possibilities. We shall see below,⁸⁴ in our description of the probable genealogy of P_8 , that some considerations of this sort must be taken into account. The divisions in P_8 , then, do not in themselves constitute a decisive criterion, though they give us information which, along with other criteria, may help us explain the date and nature of the manuscript.

C. *The Text*

We now come to our surest guide in the present problem, the text. As I have already stated,⁸⁵ I present below only the readings which I consider as possessing significance. I have arranged each item in the following way: (1) the name of the book of the Bible, followed by a colon (this name will appear only at the head of each book unless definitely necessary elsewhere), (2) an Arabic numeral (followed by a comma) to denote the chapter^{85a} (this numeral will occur ordinarily only for the *first* appearance of a chapter), (3) an Arabic numeral (followed by a colon) to denote the verse,^{85b} (4) the lemma (followed by a single bracket:]), that is, the reading adopted by Wordsworth and White in their larger edition,⁸⁶ (5) the variants in *Morgan 191* (denoted by *Mor*), *Paris, B. N., lat 3* (P_3), and *Paris, B. N., lat. 8847* (P_8). Furthermore, I shall employ certain symbols (placed at the left of the first Arabic numeral) to indicate (1) readings in which P_8 agrees with *Mor* but not with P_3 (★), (2) readings in which P_8 agrees with P_3 and not

⁸³ The Bible of Monza has divisions for all four Gospels, but a set of capitula for *Luke* only. The Bible of Basel has divisions for *Matthew* alone, but no capitula. The St. Gall Bible, finally, has merely 'traces' of divisions, but no actual divisions or capitula. See Köhler, *Schule*, pp. 324-325; 'Alcuin's Bible,' pp. 378-381; Dom de Bruyne, *art. cit.*, pp. 356-357.

⁸⁴ P. 172.

⁸⁵ P. 143.

^{85a} Or sometimes the page in Wordsworth and White's larger edition.

^{85b} Or line.

⁸⁶ J. Wordsworth and H. J. White, *Novum Testamentum . . . secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi ediderunt* (Oxford, 1889-1922).

with *Mor* (x), and (3) readings in which *P*₈ is independent of both *Mor* and *P*₃ (j). Other readings will appear without any symbol at the left of the first Arabic numeral.

The list of variants follows:

Epistula ad Damasum:

Incipit, etc.] Incp̄ praef̄ sc̄i Hieroñ p̄rb̄ in ev̄gl̄ Mor Inc̄ praef̄ sc̄i Hieronimi p̄rb̄i *P*₃
*Incipit preft̄ Hieronymi p̄rb̄i in evangelium P*₈ — ★ p. 1, 1: facere me] *Mor P*₈ me
 facere *P*₃ — ★ 5: mundum] *P*₃ iam mundum *Mor P*₈ — j 8: clamans] *Mor P*₈ m. 2
 clamas *P*₃ clamitans *P*₈ m. 1 — j p. 2, 2: respondeant quibus: tot] *P*₃ respondeant
 quibus tot enim *Mor* respondeant enim quibus tot *P*₈ — j 2: sunt paene] *Mor*
 sunt exemplaria pene *P*₃ sunt pene exemplaria *P*₈ — x 12: Hebraeis] *Mor* hebrai-
 cis *P*₃ *P*₈ — ★ 12: cum] *P*₃ quod *Mor P*₈ — x 13: diversos] *P*₃ *P*₈ ras. (= in) +
 diversos *Mor* — j 18: haec] *Mor P*₃ hoc *P*₈ — ★ p. 3, 3: temperavimus] *Mor P*₈
 imperavimus *P*₃ — ★ 7: quodsi] *P*₃ *P*₈ m. 2 quos si *Mor P*₈ m. 1 — x 8: vel
 (vicina)] *Mor* m. 2 *P*₃ *P*₈ om. *Mor* m. 1 — x 8: cognoscat] *P*₃ *P*₈ agnoscit *Mor* —
 x 10: dum] *P*₃ *P*₈ cum *Mor* — ★ 11: expressit] *P*₃ expresserit *Mor* exp̄sserit *P*₈
 — x 11: e] *P*₃ *P*₈ ex *Mor* — x 13: Lucae atque Matthei] *P*₃ *P*₈ Lucam atque
 Mattheum *Mor* — ★ p. 4, 8-9: doceberis] *P*₈ m. 2 docebiris *Mor P*₈ m. 1 deceberis
*P*₃ — 12: vicinia] vicinio *Mor* vicino *P*₃ vicini/o (*littera una erasa*) *P*₈ — j 16:
 Explicit epistula Hieronymi] Explicit praefatio *Mor P*₃ Explicit *P*₈

'Sciendum etiam . . .'

Incipit Argumentum Evangeliorum] Incp̄t argumentū eiusdē in ev̄gl̄ Mor Item
 argumentum *P*₃ om. *P*₈ — ★ p. 5, 1: etiam] *P*₃ tamen *Mor P*₈ — ★ 1: quis]
*Mor P*₈ quem *P*₃ — ★ 2: sicubi] *Mor P*₈ sicut *P*₃ — ★ 3: vel tert.] *P*₃ om.
*Mor P*₈ — ★ 4: habuerint] *Mor P*₈ habuerit *P*₃ — ★ 4: e] *Mor P*₈ et *P*₃ —
 ★ 4: discrepantes] *Mor P*₈ discrepans *P*₃ — x 4: quod] *P*₃ *P*₈ om. *Mor* — j 6:
 sint] *P*₈ sunt *Mor P*₃ — ★ 8: idem] *Mor P*₈ ibidem *P*₃ — x 9: in pr.] *P*₃ *P*₈
 iam *Mor* — x 9: inveniat] *P*₃ *P*₈ inveniantur *Mor* — ★ 10: non erit] *Mor P*₈
 noverit *P*₃ — ★ 10: quin] *Mor P*₈ quod *P*₃ — j 11: terque] *P*₈ ter *Mor P*₃ —
 ★ 11: sit] *P*₃ .ē. *Mor P*₈ — ★ 11: alteri vero] *P*₃ alter alterive *Mor P*₈ — ★ 12:
 in pr.] *P*₃ om. *Mor P*₈ — 13: Hoc et in] *P*₃ et hoc in *Mor* & (+parva ras.) hoc
*P*₈ m. 1 & hoc in *P*₈ m. 2 — ★ 15: est] *Mor P*₈ + opto ut in xp̄o valeas et memi-
 neris mei beatissime papa *P*₃

'Plures fuisse . . .'

p. 11: *Incipit Prologus Quattuor Evangeliorum] Item praefatio Mor* It̄ argum̄t
 sc̄i hieroñ *P*₃ om. *P*₈ — ★ 5: heresium] *P*₃ hereseon *Mor P*₈ — ★ 6: Mat-
 thian] *Mor P*₈ Matthiā *P*₃ — x 10: illud] *P*₃ *P*₈ om. *Mor* — x 14: enim] *P*₃
*P*₈ autem *Mor* — x p. 12, 4: quasi] *P*₃ *P*₈ et *Mor* — 5: mobilibus] *P*₃ im-
 mobilib; *Mor* (ras.) mobilib; *P*₈ — x 5: Primus] *Mor* m. 2 *P*₃ *P*₈ primum *Mor*
 m. 1 — x 6: sermone] *P*₃ *P*₈ +nomen *Mor* — ★ 7: in Iesum] *P*₃ in ih̄u *Mor P*₈
 — x 13: apostoli Pauli] *P*₃ *P*₈ pauli apostoli *Mor* — j 13: Boetiaeque] boeti-
 aeq; *Mor* boetiaeque; *P*₃ bithiniaeq; *P*₈ — x 14: confitetur] *P*₃ *P*₈ confiteretur
Mor — 15: describens] *P*₃ *P*₈ m. 2 (m. 1 describens) creditur *Mor* — x 16: super]
*P*₃ *P*₈ supra *Mor* — j p. 13, 4: ita facturum] *P*₈ se ita facturum *Mor* ita facturum
 se *P*₃ — ★ 5: caelo] *P*₃ e caelo *Mor P*₈ — ★ ? 18: pedes] *P*₃ +ras. (ca. 4 litterae)
*P*₈ +eorum *Mor* — x 19-20: in rota] *Mor* in rotam *P*₃ *P*₈ — ★ 14, 2: leoni] *P*₃

leonis *Mor* leoni (s *erasum a fine*) P_3 — ★ 3 vitulo] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ vituli *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — ★ ? 8: vivis] $P_3 P_8$ (v *sec. m. 2 in ras.*) viris *Mor*

Argumentum Matthæi:

★ p. 15, 1: ex Iudæis] *om. Mor. P₈ m. 1* ex iudæa $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ — ∩ 1: ponitur] $P_8 m. 1$ +ita *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ — ∩ 3: in carne] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ carnis *Mor* carni $P_8 m. 1$ — ∩ p. 16, 1: sicque] *siq, Mor* P_3 *sitq; P₈* — ★ 1: quaterno denario] quaternario denario *Mor* P_8 quater denario P_3 — ★ 2: ex electione] usq, $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ electio *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — ∩ 3: a transmigatione] *Mor* a transmigrationis die P_3 ad transmigationis $P_8 m. 1$ ad transmigationis die $P_8 m. 2$ — ★ 3: ad Christum] *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ in xpm P_3 in xpo $P_8 m. 2$ — x 3: decursam] $P_3 P_8$ decursum *Mor* — ★ 4: ut et] *Mor* P_8 ut P_3 — ★ ? 4: satisfaciens] $P_3 P_8$ (iens *in ras. m. 2*) satisfaceret *Mor* — ★ ? 5: ostenderet] $P_3 P_8$ (r& *in ras. m. 2*) ostendens *Mor* — ★ 9: ea] *Mor* P_8 eam P_3 — ★ 11: quia] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ qui *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — ★ 11: est] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ *om. Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — ★ ? p. 17, 1: in] $P_3 P_8$ (*supra lineam, m. 2?*) *om. Mor* — ★ 2: esse] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ *om. Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — 4: EXPLICIT] +Prologus *Mor* +prologus in evangelio Matthæi P_3 prologus explicit prologus (*ultima dua verba rubro colore*) P_8

Matthæw:

★ Chap. 1, 2: (Isaac) autem] P_3 *om. Mor* P_8 — 20: in ea natum est] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ *in ras.* ex ea nascetur *Mor* — ∩ 22: id] *Mor* P_3 *om. P₈* — ★ 24: praecepit ei] *Mor* P_8 (it ei *in ras.*) ei praecepit P_3 — Chap. 2, 6: reget] *Mor* regat $P_3 P_8$ (a *in ras. m. 2*) — x 11: murrā] *murra Mor* myrrā P_3 myrram P_8 — ★ 14: recessit] *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ secessit $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ — x 21: surgens] $P_3 P_8$ consurgens *Mor* — ∩ 22: illuc ire] *Mor* P_3 ire illo (" *signa inversionis a m. 1*) P_8 — x ? Chap. 3, 3: Esaiam] $P_3 P_8$ (?) $m. 1$ isaim *Mor* (cf. 4, 14 et 12, 17) $P_3 m. 2$ — 3: qui dictus] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ quo dictū *Mor* quod dictum $P_8 m. 1$ — ★ 9: potest] P_3 potens .ē. *Mor* P_8 — ∩ 11: baptizabit] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ baptizavit $P_8 m. 1$ — ∩ 12: permundabit] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ permundavit $P_8 m. 1$ — ★ 16: Iesus] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ *in marg. om. Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — ★ 16: columbam] P_3 +et *Mor* P_8 — ★ 16: venientem] *Mor* P_8 et venientem P_3 — ★ Chap. 4, 4: vivit] *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ vivet $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ — ∩ 12: audisset] *Mor* P_3 +ihs P_8 — x 14: Esaiam] $P_3 P_8 m. 1$ isaiam *Mor* $P_8 m. 2$ — ★ 14: impleretur] P_3 adimpleretur *Mor* P_8 — ∩ 25: sunt] *Mor* P_3 *om. P₈* — ★ Chap. 5, 9: ipsi] *Mor* P_8 *om. P₃* — ★ 15: domo] P_3 domu *Mor* P_8 — x 19: fecerit et docuerit] $P_3 P_8$ docuerit et fecerit *Mor* — x 20: enim vobis] *Mor* aut vobis P_3 vobis autem P_8 (" *signa inversionis a m. 1*) — ★ 23: offeres] *Mor* $P_3 m. 1$ offers $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ — x 24: offers] *Mor* offeres $P_3 P_8$ — 36: iuraveris] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ iurabis *Mor* iuraris $P_8 m. 1$ — ∩ 37: abundantius] *Mor* P_3 abnuntius P_8 — ★ ? 40: remitte] *Mor* dimitte $P_3 P_8$ (di *m. 2 in ras.*) — ★ 42: Qui] *Mor* P_8 et qui P_3 — ★ 43: odio habebis] *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ odies $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ — ★ ? 47: facitis] P_3 facietis *Mor* faci/tis (= *ras.*) P_8 — ★ Chap. 6, 7: quia] *Mor* P_8 quod P_3 — x 8: enim] $P_8 m. 2$ nam *Mor* namq; $P_3 P_8 m. 1$ — x 9: es in caelis] *Mor* in caelis es $P_8 P_3$ (*parva rasura praeposita*) — ★ 10: adveniat] *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ veniat $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ — ∩ ? 22: corporis est oculus] corporis tui est oculus *Mor* corporis (*ras.*) .ē. oculus (*ras.*) P_3 corporis tui est oculus tuus P_8 — ★ 34: ipse] *Mor* P_8 ipsi P_3 — ★ Chap. 7, 2: metietur] P_3 remetietur *Mor* P_8 — ★ 10: petet] P_3 petierit *Mor* P_8 — ★ 11: bona (dare)] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ bona data *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — x 12: eis] $P_3 P_8$ illis *Mor* — ★ 25: et (descendit)] P_3 *om. Mor* P_8 — ★ 27: et (descendit)] P_3 *om. Mor* P_8 — ★ 29: non] *Mor* P_8 et non P_3 — x Chap. 8, 13: hora illa] $P_3 P_8$

illa hora *Mor* — x 17: *Esaiam*] *P*₃ *P*₈ *isaiam Mor* — ★ 20: Et (dicit)] *P*₃ *om.*
*Mor P*₈ — x 20: ei] *P*₃ *P*₈ *illi Mor* — 20: tabernacula] *P*₈ *nidos Mor P*₃ —
x 27: quia] *P*₃ *P*₈ *quia et Mor* — ★ 29: tibi] *P*₃ +ihū *Mor P*₈ — ★ Chap. 9, 2:
et videns Iesus] *P*₃ *P*₈ *m. 2* *videns autem Iesus Mor P*₈ *m. 1* — 5: peccata] *Mor*
*P*₃ +tua *P*₈ — NOTE: Fol. 95 in *P*₈ (Chap. 9, 12—Chap. 11, 7, near the end) is by
a much later hand, perhaps late saec. x, and is therefore useless for collation here. I
therefore omit this portion in *Mor* and *P*₃ also. — ★ Chap. 11, 10: enim est] *Mor P*₈
+ē. enim *P*₃ — ★ 12: rapiunt] *P*₃ *diripiunt Mor P*₈ — 30: leve est] *Mor* *leve P*₃
*suave est P*₈ (*homoeoteleuton*) — x Chap. 12, 3: quid] *P*₃ *P*₈ *quod Mor* — ★ 17:
Esaiam] *P*₃ *isaiam Mor P*₈ — 18: placuit] *Mor* *complacuit P*₃ *conplacuit P*₈ —
★ 19: aliquis] *Mor P*₈ +in plateis *P*₃ — 24: eicit] *Mor P*₃ *eiecit P*₈ (*sic genera-*
liter) — ★ ? 25: desolatur] *Mor* *desolabitur P*₃ *desola (ras. 2 litter.) tur P*₈ (This
may indicate a selection of variants offered in A. T., but is perhaps merely a later
correction.) — 29: Aut] *Mor P*₃ *P*₈ *m. 2* at *P*₈ *m. 1* — ★ 48: ille] *P*₃ *ipse*
*Mor P*₈ — ★ 49: manum] *P*₃ *manus Mor P*₈ — x 49: discipulos] *P*₃ *P*₈ +suos
Mor — 6: et] *Mor P*₃ *P*₈ *m. 2 (om. m. 1)* — 8: vero] *Mor P*₃ aut *P*₈ *m. 2 in ras.*
— 13, 14: et adimpletur] *P*₃ *ut adimpletur Mor* *et adimpleatur P*₈ —
★ 14: eis] *Mor P*₈ *in eis P*₃ — ★ 14: *Esaias*] *P*₃ *isaiae Mor P*₈ — 15: enim]
*Mor P*₃ *om. P*₈ — ★ 15: cluserunt] *P*₃ *P*₈ *m. 2* *clausuerunt Mor P*₈ *m. 1* — ★ 23:
centum] *Mor P*₈ *m. 1* *centesimum P*₃ *P*₈ *m. 2* — ★ 23: sexaginta] *Mor P*₈ *m. 1*
*sexagesimū P*₃ *P*₈ *m. 2* — ★ 23: triginta] *Mor P*₈ *m. 1* *tricesimum P*₃ *trigesimū P*₈
m. 2 — 35: dictum erat] *P*₈ *dictum .ē. Mor P*₃ — ★ 38: zizania] *Mor P*₈
*zazania P*₃ — ★ 43: sui] *P*₃ *eorum Mor P*₈ — x 47: genere] *Mor* +piscium
*P*₃ *P*₈ — ★ 50: mittent] *Mor P*₈ *mittet P*₈ (*cf. mittet 41 et 42*) — 14, 1:
audii] *Mor P*₃ *audivit P*₈ — ★ 3: carcerem] *Mor P*₈ *carcere P*₃ — x 5: illum]
*Mor P*₈ *m. 2* *eum P*₃ *P*₈ *m. 1* — ★ 9: iuramentum] *P*₃ *ius iurandum Mor P*₈ —
10: Iohannem] *Mor P*₃ *Iohannen P*₈ — 18: illos mihi huc] *Mor P*₃ *huc illos*
*mihi P*₈ — ★ 22: discipulos] *P*₃ +suos *Mor P*₈ — ★ 35: omnes] *P*₃ *om. Mor P*₈
— x 36: tetigerunt] *P*₃ *P*₈ *tetigerant Mor* — x Chap. 15, 2: traditionem] *P*₃ *P*₈
traditiones Mor — ★ 4: (patrem) tuum] *Mor P*₈ *m. 1* *om. P*₃ *P*₈ *m. 2* — x 6:
matrem] *Mor* +suam *P*₃ *P*₈ — ★ 7: *Esaias*] *P*₃ *isaias Mor P*₈ — ★ 9: doctrinas]
*P*₃ *P*₈ *m. 2* +et *Mor P*₈ *m. 1* — 22: mei, Domine] *Mor P*₃ *P*₈ *m. 2 (om. m. 1)* —
24: perierunt] *Mor P*₃ *perierant P*₈ — x 28: (filia) illius] *Mor* *eius P*₃ *ei P*₈ —
x 31: videntes] *P*₃ *P*₈ +autem *Mor* — 32: iam perseverant] *P*₃ *Mor (iam p in*
*ras., m. 2?) P*₈ (*p in ras.; iam a m. 2*) — ★ 32: suis] *Mor P*₈ *om. P*₃ — 35:
discumberet] *Mor P*₃ *discumberent P*₈ — 38: manducaverunt] *Mor P*₃ *mandu-*
*cauerunt P*₈ — 38: hominum] *P*₃ *virorum Mor* *ominum P*₈ *in ras.* — x Chap.
16, 3: potestis] *P*₃ *P*₈ +scire *Mor* — x 4: *Ionas*] *P*₃ *P*₈ +prophetae *Mor* —
★ 5: eius] *Mor P*₈ *om. P*₃ — ? 8: dixit] *P*₈ (+eis, nunc erasum) +eis *Mor P*₃ —
x 9: quinque milium hominum] in quinque milia hominum *Mor P*₈ *et quinque*
*milia hominum P*₃ — x 10: quattuor milium] in quattuor milia *Mor* *et quattuor*
*milia P*₃ *P*₈ — 11: Pharisaeorum et Sadducaeorum] *Mor P*₃ *reversum est P*₈ —
★ 15: Dicit illis] *Mor P*₈ *m. 1* +ih̄s *P*₃ +ih̄s *P*₈ *m. 2* — 17: dixit] *P*₈ +ei
*Mor P*₃ — x 18: adversum] *Mor* *adversus P*₃ *P*₈ — ★ 21: oporteret] *Mor P*₈
*oportet P*₃ — 23: post] *P*₃ *P*₈ *in ras.* *retro Mor* — 23: (sapis) ea] *Mor P*₃ *P*₈
m. 2 (om. m. 1) — 26: mundum universum] *P*₈ *universum mundum Mor P*₃ —
★ 27: opus] *Mor P*₈ *opera P*₃ — ★ Chap. 17, 3: apparuit illis] *P*₃ *apparuerunt eis*
*Mor P*₈ — ★ 4: et (Mosi)] *Mor P*₈ *om. P*₃ — 5: nubis] *P*₈ *nubes Mor P*₃ —
x 7: et (nolite)] *Mor P*₈ *m. 2 om. P*₃ *P*₈ *m. 1* — ★ 10: oporteat] *Mor P*₈ *oportet*

P_3 — \mathfrak{D} 18: et (exiit)] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — \star ? 20: illis] P_3 illis $\bar{i}hs$ *Mor* illis +ras. (3-4 litter.) P_8 — \mathfrak{D} 24: dixerunt] P_8 +ei *Mor* P_3 — x Chap. 18, 3: dixit] P_3 P_8 ait *Mor* — \mathfrak{D} 4: se] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — \star 9: \dagger unoculum†] eum uno oculo P_8 cū uno oculo *Mor* unū oculū habentē P_3 — \star ? 13: gaudebit] *Mor* gaudet P_3 P_8 m. 2 (t in ras. trium litterarum) — \star 13: super (nonaginta)] *Mor* P_8 supra P_3 — \star 15: autem] *Mor* P_8 om. P_3 — \mathfrak{D} 16: adhuc] *Mor* P_3 om. P_8 — x 18: quaecumque] *Mor* quodecūq; P_3 quodcumq; P_8 — \mathfrak{D} 24: est] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — \star 25: reddi] P_3 +debitum *Mor* P_8 — x 29: in (me)] P_3 P_8 om. *Mor* — \star 31: erant] *Mor* P_8 fuerant P_3 — x Chap. 19, 2: eum] P_3 P_8 om. *Mor* — \mathfrak{D} 4: et] *Mor* P_3 aut P_8 — \star 7: ait] P_3 et ait *Mor* & ait P_8 — x 10: muliere] *Mor* uxore P_3 P_8 — \star 12: matris utero] *Mor* P_8 ventre matris P_3 — x? 12: eunuchizaverunt] P_3 castraverunt *Mor* P_8 (castra in ras. m. 2) \star 28: illis] P_3 eis *Mor* P_8 — Chap. 20, 7: vineam] *Mor* P_8 m. 2 vineam P_8 m. 1 vineā meam P_3 — x 19: deludendum] P_3 P_8 inludendum *Mor* — \star 21: Qui vixit] P_3 dixitque *Mor* dixitq; P_8 — x 23: et sinistram] P_3 P_8 vel ad sinistram *Mor* — 25: principes gentium dominantur] *Mor* princeps dominant² (domin in ras.) P_3 principes gentium dominantur P_8 m. 2 (princeps gentium dominantur m. 1) — \star 29: eum] *Mor* P_8 om. P_3 — x Chap. 21, 7: eis] *Mor* eos P_3 P_8 — \star 9: venturus est] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 (nunc erasum est) venit P_3 P_8 m. 2 — x 16: ei] P_3 P_8 om. *Mor* — \star 21: facietis] *Mor* P_8 +hoc P_3 — \star 23: tibi dedit] *Mor* P_8 dedit tibi P_3 — \star 31: in regnum] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 in regno P_3 P_8 m. 2 — x 31: dicunt] P_3 P_8 +ei *Mor* — \star ? 32: (venit) enim] *Mor* autem P_3 P_8 m. 2 in ras. — \star 34: suos] P_3 om. *Mor* P_8 — \star 34: fructus] *Mor* P_8 fructum P_3 — x? 41: vineam] *Mor* vineam (+suam in ras.) P_8 vineā (+ras.: = suā?) P_3 — \star Chap. 22, 4: servos] P_3 P_8 m. 2 +suos *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — \star 5: et abierunt] *Mor* P_8 om. P_3 — \mathfrak{D} 19: ostendite] *Mor* P_3 ostende P_8 — \mathfrak{D} 46: quisquam ex illa die] *Mor* P_3 ex illa die quisquam P_8 — \mathfrak{D} Chap. 23, 1: ad (discipulos)] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — \mathfrak{D} 3: ergo] *Mor* P_3 om. P_8 — x 8: enim est] *Mor* .ē. enim P_3 ē enim P_8 — \mathfrak{D} 9: enim est] P_8 .ē. enim *Mor* P_3 — \star 13: quia] *Mor* P_8 qui P_3 — \star 13: intrare] *Mor* P_8 (a in ras. m. 2) introire P_3 — x 15: quia] *Mor* qui P_3 P_8 — \star 15: circumitis] *Mor* P_3 circuitis P_8 — x 16: debet] P_3 P_8 debitor .ē. *Mor* — \star 20: in altari] P_3 P_8 m. 2 in altare *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — x 21: inhabitat] *Mor* habitat P_3 P_8 — \star 21: qui] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 quicūq; P_3 P_8 m. 2 — \star 23: vae vobis] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 +autem P_3 P_8 m. 2 — \star 23 et 25: quia] *Mor* P_8 qui P_3 — x 37: quotiens] *Mor* P_8 m. 2 quoties P_3 P_8 m. 1 — \mathfrak{D} Chap. 24, 2: super] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 sub P_8 m. 1 — \mathfrak{D} 4: vos seducat] *Mor* P_8 seducat vos P_8 — x 6: haec fieri] P_3 P_8 fieri haec *Mor* — x 15: abominationem] *Mor* abhominatiōē P_3 P_8 — x 16: ad] P_3 P_8 in *Mor* (homoeoteleuton) — \star 23: hic] *Mor* P_8 +.ē. P_3 — x 27: et (adventus)] *Mor* P_8 m. 2 om. P_3 P_8 m. 1 — \star 29: commovebuntur] *Mor* P_8 movebuntur P_3 — \star 34: omnia haec] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 omnia P_3 hęc omnia P_8 m. 2 — \star 42: duo in lecto unus assumetur et alter relinquetur] P_3 om. *versum* om. *Mor* P_8 (an excellent criterion) — \star 43: sit] P_3 est *Mor* P_8 — \mathfrak{D} 46: est] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — \star 47: eius] *Mor* P_8 suus P_3 — \star 50: ebriis] ebriosus *Mor* P_8 ebrios P_3 — x Chap. 25, 5: moram] P_3 P_8 mora *Mor* — \star 11: novissime] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 +vero P_3 P_8 m. 2 — \mathfrak{D} 14: suos] *Mor* P_3 om. P_8 — 20: mihi tradidisti] *Mor* tradidisti mihi P_3 tradedisti mihi P_8 — \mathfrak{D} 21: serve bone] P_8 bone serve *Mor* P_3 — \star ? 22: accessit] P_3 P_8 m. 2 (ssit in ras.) accedens *Mor* — x 22: et ait] P_3 P_8 ait *Mor* — x 23: supra] *Mor* super P_3 P_8 — x 24: et metis] P_3 P_8 metis *Mor* — \star 27: mittere] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 cōmittere P_3 committere P_8 m. 2 — \star 36: eram] P_3 P_8 m. 2 om. *Mor* P_8 m. 1 —

★? 38: collegimus] P_3 P_8 $m. 2$ (gi in ras. $m. 2$) collegimus *Mor* — ★ 43: collegistis] P_3 P_8 $m. 2$ collegistis *Mor* P_8 $m. 1$ — ★ 44: respondebunt] *Mor* P_8 +ei P_3 — x Chap. 26, 11: habetis] *Mor* habebitis P_3 P_8 — 12: unguentum] *Mor* P_3 unguentum P_8 — x 14: dicebatur] *Mor* dicit² P_3 dicitur P_8 — x 15: vultis mihi] P_3 P_8 mihi vultis *Mor* — ★ 17: prima autem] P_3 P_8 $m. 2$ +die *Mor* P_8 $m. 1$ (die nunc erasum) — 21: me] *Mor* P_3 P_8 $m. 2$ (om. $m. 1$) — x 23: At] P_3 P_8 et *Mor* — ★ 32: autem] *Mor* P_8 om. P_3 — 35: et] *Mor* P_3 om. P_8 — 39: Pater] P_8 pater mi *Mor* mi pater P_3 — ★ 40: discipulos] P_3 P_8 $m. 2$ +suos *Mor* P_8 $m. 1$ — 56: implerentur] adimplerentur *Mor* P_3 adimpleret' P_8 — x 57: ubi] P_3 P_8 quo *Mor* — ★ 61: falsi] *Mor* P_8 falsum P_3 — x 71: alia] P_3 P_8 +ancilla *Mor* — ★? 72: novi] P_3 P_8 (+ras. trium litterarum) novisset *Mor* — ★ 75: ploravit] P_3 flevit *Mor* P_8 — ★ Chap. 27, 6: corbanan] P_3 P_8 $m. 2$ corbonan *Mor* P_8 $m. 1$ — 8: Acheldemach] *Mor* Acheldemagh hoc .ē. P_3 Acheldemach hoc .ē. P_8 — ★ 13: dicant] P_3 diciunt *Mor* P_8 — x 16: autem] P_3 P_8 om. *Mor* — ★? 16: vinctum] P_3 ras. (4-5 litterarum) +vinctum P_8 unum vinctum *Mor* — ★ 16: add. P_3 qui prop̄ homicidiū missus fuerat in carcere — 21: vobis] *Mor* P_3 om. P_8 — 32: Cyreneum] add. P_3 venuentē obviā sibi — ★ 35: add. P_3 $m. 1$ et *Mor* ut impleretur quod dictum .ē. per prophetam dicentem. diviserunt vestimenta mea (+sibi P_8 $m. 2$) et super vestem meam miserunt sortem add. P_3 ut adimpleret² quod dictū .ē. p prophetam dicentē divider̄ vestim̄ta mea sibi et sup vestē meā miser̄ sortē — 40: templum] P_8 dei *Mor* P_3 — ★ 46: heli, heli, lema sabacthani] P_3 heloi heloi lama zaptani *Mor* P_8 $m. 1$ heli heli laema sazaptani P_8 $m. 2$ — ★ 46: hoc est] P_3 quod .ē. *Mor* P_8 $m. 1$ ($m. 2$ lineam per verba duxit) — 64: surrexit] *Mor* P_3 P_8 $m. 2$ resurrexit P_8 $m. 1$ — Chap. 28, 6: venite] *Mor* P_3 P_8 $m. 1$ (+& $m. 2$) — ★ 7: praedixi] *Mor* P_8 $m. 1$ (prae nunc erasum) dixi P_3 P_8 $m. 2$ — Post explicit, etc.] ver̄s. ii .DCC. *Mor* habet ver̄s num̄. iiDCC P_3 V . ii d̄cc P_8 $m. 2$ (om. $m. 1$)

Argumentum Marci:

★ p. 171, 1: dei] P_3 +electus *Mor* P_8 $m. 1$ (nunc expunctum) — x 2: Israel] in isrl̄ P_3 P_8 om. *Mor* — ★ p. 172, 1: caro] P_3 carnem *Mor* P_8 — ★ 1: domini] *Mor* P_8 +in omnia P_3 — ★ 4: Denique] *Mor* P_8 +et P_3 — ★ 5: baptismo] *Mor* P_8 baptisma P_3 — ★ 6: in primis] *Mor* inprimis P_8 $m. 1$ in exprimis P_3 P_8 $m. 2$ — ★ 9-10: perficiendo operi] P_3 perficiendi operis *Mor* pficiendi operis P_8 — 13: scire et] *Mor* P_3 P_8 $m. 2$ scir̄& P_8 $m. 1$ — x 4: domini in carne] in carne domini P_3 P_8 in carne *Mor* — ★? 5: et] *Mor* in P_3 P_8 $m. 2$ in ras. — 8: Explicit] om. *Mor* Explicuit argumentum Marci Evangelistae P_3 explicit praefatio P_8

Mark:

★ Evangelium secundum Marcum] P_8 Evanġl seċd Marcū *Mor* Evanġl Marci P_3 — ★ Chap. 1, 1: Esaia] P_3 Isaia *Mor* P_8 — ★ 2: tuam] P_3 +ante te *Mor* P_8 $m. 1$ (expunxit $m. 2$) — 12: expellit] P_8 expulit *Mor* P_3 — 13: eratque] *Mor* P_3 P_8 $m. 2$ erat P_8 $m. 1$ — ★ 26: exiit] *Mor* P_8 exivit P_3 — 36: persecutus] P_8 prosecutus *Mor* P_3 — ★ Chap. 2, 2: domo] P_3 domu *Mor* P_8 — ★ 9: dimittuntur] P_3 demittuntur *Mor* P_8 — ★? 9: an] *Mor* aut P_3 P_8 (ut in ras. $m. 2$) — ★ 9: surge] *Mor* P_8 +et P_3 — 11: Tibi dico] *Mor* P_3 P_8 $m. 2$ (supra lineam; om. $m. 1$) — ★ 16: magister vester] *Mor* P_8 om. P_3 — ★? 17: medicum] *Mor* medico P_3 P_8 $m. 2$ in ras. — NOTE: cf. Chap. 2, 18 for evidences of correction of P_8 by mss. other than *Mor* and P_3 . ★ 20: illa die] P_3 illis diebus *Mor* P_8 — x 26: licet] *Mor* licebat P_3 P_8 — x Chap. 3, 6: adversus] P_3 P_8 adversum *Mor* — 7: et (multa)] *Mor* P_3 +cum P_8 — x 9: deserviret] P_3 P_8 $m. 1$ deservirent *Mor* P_8 $m. 2$ —

★ 10: quotquot] P_3 +autem Mor P_8 — 11: clamabant] P_8 exclamabant Mor P_3 — 19: et (tradidit)] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 1 (nunc erasum) — ★ 22: daemonum] P_3 daemoniorum Mor P_8 — 26: consurrexit] Mor P_3 consurrexerit P_8 — 1 Chap. 4, 8: dabat] Mor P_3 dabit P_8 — 10: parabolae] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 1 parabolam P_8 m. 2 — ★ ? 15: corda] corde Mor cordibus P_3 cordib; (ib; in ras. m. 2) P_8 — x 22: factum est] P_3 P_8 factum Mor — ★ 26: homo iaciat] P_3 iaciat homo Mor P_8 — ★ 32: ascendit] P_3 ascendet Mor ascend& P_8 — 35: illa die] Mor P_3 in die illa P_8 — ★ 36: erat in navi] P_3 in navi erat Mor P_8 — x 37: navem] P_3 P_8 navi Mor (a 36 iteratum?) — ★ Chap. 5, 1: venerunt] Mor P_8 veniunt P_3 — 7: dicit] Mor dixi ei P_3 dixit P_8 m. 2 in ras. — ★ 9: Et dicit ei] Mor P_8 om. P_3 — ★ 13: in mare] P_3 in mari Mor P_8 — 16: qui (viderant)] Mor P_3 quid P_8 — 17: a] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 1 (de m. 2) — 18: ascenderet] Mor P_3 consder& (sic! cons in ras. m. 2) P_8 — ★ 19: Et] P_3 ihs autem Mor P_8 — 29: sanguinis] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 sanguis P_8 m. 1 — 29: corpore] P_8 corpori Mor P_3 — 33: venit] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — 35: ab] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 ad P_8 m. 1 — ★ 38: in] Mor P_8 m. 1 ad P_3 P_8 m. 2 — 38: videt] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 vidit P_8 m. 1 — 38: heulantes] P_3 eiulantes Mor eiulabunt P_8 — x 40: ingreditur] Mor ingrediuntur P_3 P_8 — 42: ambulabat] Mor P_3 ambulat P_8 — 42: obstipuerunt] P_8 obstupuerunt Mor obstupuer P_3 — ★ Chap. 6, 5: ullam] P_3 multas Mor P_8 — ★ ? 6: illorum] P_3 P_8 (ill m. 2 in ras.) eorum Mor — ★ 13: ungebant] Mor P_8 m. 1 ungebant P_3 P_8 m. 2 — x 13: aegrotos] Mor aegros P_3 P_8 — ★ 14: Baptista] Mor P_8 baptisma P_3 — ★ 15: dicebant] Mor P_8 m. 1 +quia P_3 P_8 m. 2 — 17: enim] Mor P_3 autem P_8 — ★ ? 17: ac] P_3 P_8 m. 2 in ras. et Mor — 21: natali suo] P_8 m. 2 natalis sui Mor P_3 natalis suo P_8 m. 1 — 22: quod] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 quid P_8 m. 1 — ★ 23: dimidium] P_3 P_8 m. 2 dimediū Mor dimedium P_8 m. 1 — 24: At] Mor P_3 om. P_8 m. 1 et P_8 m. 2 — ★ 25: protinus] Mor P_8 protenus P_3 — ? 27: speculatore] Mor spiculatore P_3 P_8 m. 2 (m. 1 speculore?) — 28: in disco] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 in marg. (om. m. 1) — ★ 34: multam turbam Iesus] P_3 ihs turbam multam Mor P_8 — 37: eis vos] Mor illis (vos om.) P_3 illis P_8 (vos nunc erasum — m. 2?) — ★ 43: cophinos] Mor P_8 om. P_3 — x 56: (aut) in] Mor om. P_3 P_8 — ★ ? Chap. 7, 3: traditionem] P_3 traditionē P_8 m. 2 (in ras. +ras. unae litterae) traditiones Mor — ★ 6: Esaias] P_3 Isaias Mor P_8 m. 1 ęsaias P_8 m. 2 — ★ 6: est (a me)] Mor P_8 m. 1 ab .ē. P_3 abē P_8 m. 2 — ★ ? 7: doctrinas] P_3 +et Mor +ras. (et sine multo dubio) P_8 — ★ 8: alia similia] Mor P_8 alia multa similia P_3 — ★ ? 15: communicant] P_3 P_8 m. 2 coinquant Mor P_8 m. 1 (sine multo dubio) — ★ 19: introit] Mor P_8 introiit P_3 — 19: ventrem] Mor P_3 +ras. (= vadit) P_8 — ? 26: autem] Mor P_3 enim P_8 m. 2 in ras. — 26: eiceret] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 eiecer& P_8 m. 1 (P_8 eiecio creberrime: cf. Mark, Chap. 9: 18, 28, etc.) — 31: exiens] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 1 +iHs P_8 m. 2 — 33: et (expuens)] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — 37: et (eo)] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — ? Chap. 8, 5: dixerunt] Mor P_3 P_8 (ixerunt m. 2 in ras.) — 6: supra] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 sup P_8 m. 1 — 15: videte] Mor P_3 +ras. (= &) P_8 — ★ 20: tulistis] P_3 sustulistis Mor P_8 — ★ 33: retro me Satana] Mor P_8 m. 1 retro me Satanas P_8 m. 2 retro Satanas P_3 — ★ 34: post] Mor P_8 om. P_3 — x ? 34: se ipsum] Mor semet ipsum P_3 semeipsū P_8 m. 1 (semetipsū m. 2) — x 37: commutationem] Mor commutationis P_3 P_8 — 38: confusus] Mor (in ras. m. 1) P_3 (corr. m. 1 vel. m. 2; m. 1 confessus) P_8 (prima littera u in ras. — m. 2) — ★ ? 38: sanctis] P_3 scis P_8 (c in ras. m. 2) suis Mor — 1 Chap. 9, 2: solos] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 solus P_8 m. 1 — 3: splendentia] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 1 +& P_8 m. 2 — 5: hic nos] nos hic Mor P_3 P_8 (sed m. 2 invertit) — 8: secum]

Mor $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ *om.* $P_8 m. 1$ — $\text{J } 9$: vidissent] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ audissent $P_8 m. 1$ — 11: oporteat] $P_8 m. 2$ oportet *Mor* P_3 oportet & $P_8 m. 1$ — ★ 15: eum] *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ ihm P_3 iHm $P_8 m. 2$ — $\text{J } 15$: et accurrentes] $P_8 m. 2$ (et *om.* $m. 1$) accurrentesq; *Mor* P_3 — $\text{J } 15$: salutabant] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ salutabunt $P_8 m. 1$ — x 18: stridet] $P_3 P_8$ (t in ras.) stridit *Mor* — $\text{J } 19$: respondens] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ respondit $P_8 m. 1$ — $\text{J } 20$: statim] *Mor* P_3 *om.* P_8 — x 22: et (in ignem)] *Mor* $P_8 m. 2$ et *om.* $P_3 P_8 m. 1$ — $\text{J } 22$: in aquas] *Mor* P_3 aquas (sine in) $P_8 m. 2$ aqua (sine in) $P_8 m. 1$ — $\text{J } 22$: si] *Mor* P_3 *om.* P_8 — $\text{J } 24$: credo] *Mor* P_3 +dñe P_8 — $\text{J } 25$: concurrentem] *Mor* P_3 convertentem P_8 — 27: illum] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 1$ ($m. 2$ eum) — $\text{J } 28$: nos] *Mor* P_3 *om.* P_8 (quoniam non praecedit?) — $\text{J } 30$: nec] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ (*om.* $m. 1$) — 33: esset] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 1$ && $P_8 m. 2$ — $\text{J } 36$: ut] *Mor* P_3 cum P_8 — ★ 42: quisquis] *Mor* P_8 siquis P_3 — $\text{J } 43$: in (ignem)] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ (*om.* $m. 1$) — x 44: moritur] *Mor* $P_8 m. 2$ morietur $P_3 P_8 m. 1$ (mori&ur) — ★ 46 et 48: moritur] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ morietur *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ (mori&ur) — ★ 48: extinguitur] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ extinguetur *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ (extingu&ur) — ★ Chap. 10, 1: consueverat] *Mor* P_8 consuetudo P_3 — ★ 6: masculum] *Mor* P_8 n masculū P_3 — x 6: Deus] *Mor* $P_8 m. 2$ +et dix P_3 +& dixit $P_8 m. 1$ (nunc erasum) — $\text{J } 7$: ad] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ (*om.* $m. 1$) — ★? 9: iunxit] P_3 coniunxit *Mor* iunxit (con, nunc erasum, praeponebatur) P_8 — ★ 10: domo] P_3 domu *Mor* P_8 — $\text{J } 11$: dicit] P_8 dixit *Mor* P_3 — ? 15: vobis] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ in ras. — 15: quisquis] *Mor* P_3 quisque (e in ras. $m. 2$) P_8 — ★ 17: viam] P_3 via *Mor* P_8 — x 17: (rogabat) eum] *Mor* $P_8 m. 2$ +dicens $P_3 P_8 m. 1$ (nunc erasum) — ★ 20: Magister] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ +bone *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ (nunc erasum) — ★ 24: in (regnum)] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ *om.* *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — $\text{J } 28$: ei] *Mor* P_3 *om.* P_8 — 30: accipiat] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 1$ accipit $P_8 m. 2$ — x 33: scribis] *Mor* +et seniorib; P_3 +et senioribus P_8 — $\text{J } 34$: (conspuent) eum] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ (*om.* $m. 1$) — $\text{J } 34$: (flagellabunt) eum] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ (*om.* $m. 1$) — x 35: eum] *Mor* $P_8 m. 2$ illū P_3 illum $P_8 m. 1$ — $\text{J } 38$: bibo] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ (*om.* $m. 1$) — $\text{J } 40$: dare] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ +vobis $P_8 m. 1$ — $\text{J } ? 41$: decem] *Mor* decem P_3 decim P_8 — ★ 48: ei] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ illi *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ (nunc erasum) — 52: ait illi] $P_8 m. 2$ in ras. dixit ei *Mor* dix ei P_3 — ? Chap. 11, 7: inponunt illi] P_8 (unt in ras. $m. 2$) inponunt illi P_3 inponentes ei *Mor* — ★ 7: eum] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ eo *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — ★ 15: templo] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ templum *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — $\text{J } 16$: non] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ (*om.* $m. 1$) — ★? 16: transferret vas] P_3 vas transferret *Mor* P_8 (signa inversionis fortasse a $m. 1$) — 17: non] *Mor* $P_3 P_8$ (ras. = ne) — $\text{J } 18$: sacerdotum] *Mor* P_3 *om.* P_8 — ★ 21: dicit] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 1$ (dixit $m. 2$) — $\text{J } ? 24$: accipietis] *Mor* $P_3 P_8$ (i&is in ras. $m. 2$) — 24: veniet] venient *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 1$ evenient $P_8 m. 2$ — ★ 25: et (Pater)] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ *om.* *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — $\text{J } 26$: dimiseritis, dimittet] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ demiseritis, demittet & $P_8 m. 1$ — $\text{J } 26$: vobis] *Mor* P_3 *om.* P_8 — $\text{J } 31$: dicet] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ +nobis (nunc erasum) $P_8 m. 1$ — ★? 33: dicunt] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ in ras. (fortasse dixerunt) dixer *Mor* — ? 33: Iesu] P_3 ihu (u in ras. $m. 2$) P_8 ad ihm (?) *Mor* — 33: Nescimus] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 1$ (+& $m. 2$) — $\text{J } \text{Chap. } 12, 1$: circumdedit saepem] circumdedit sepem P_3 sepe circumdedit *Mor* saepē circumdedit P_8 — ★ 3: ceciderunt] P_3 caeciderunt *Mor* P_8 — $\text{J } 4$: in] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ (*om.* $m. 1$) — $\text{J } ? 12$: dixerit] *Mor* $P_3 P_8$ (erit in ras. $m. 2$) — ★? 14: quia] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ in ras. qñm *Mor* — ★? 14: hominum] $P_3 P_8$ (ū in ras. $m. 2$) hominis *Mor* — ★ 16: At] *Mor* P_8 et P_3 — x 16: attulerunt] $P_3 P_8$ +ei *Mor* — ★ 17: eo] *Mor* $P_3 P_8$ eum P_3 — $\text{J } 22$: (est) et] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ (*om.* $m. 1$) — x 24: Non pr.] $P_3 P_8$ nonne *Mor* — ★? 29: noster] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ in ras. tuus *Mor* — $\text{J } 31$: tamquam] *Mor* P_3 sicut P_8 — ★? 36: scabellum] $P_3 P_8$ (e in ras. $m. 2$) scabillū *Mor* — $\text{J } 39$: discubitus] *Mor* discubitos

P_8 cubitos P_3 — x Chap. 13, 1: ex] *Mor* P_8 m. 2 (m. 1 de nunc erasum) de P_3 —
 2: Tesus] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — 2? 8: super pr.] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 in ras.
 (cf. contra in aliis mss.) — ★ 10: primum] *Mor* P_8 om. P_3 — 2 11: duxerint]
Mor P_3 dixerint P_8 — ★ 11: loquimini] P_3 P_8 m. 2 loquimini *Mor* P_8 m. 1 —
 ★ 15: ne] *Mor* P_8 n̄ P_3 — 2 16: erit] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 erat P_8 m. 1 — 2 17:
 praegnatis] *Mor* praegnantib; P_3 praegnantib; P_8 — 2 17: nutrientibus] *Mor*
 P_3 enutrientib; P_8 — 2? 18: fiant] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 in ras. — 2 25: stellae caeli
 erunt] *Mor* P_3 erunt stellae caeli P_8 — 2 30: transibit] *Mor* P_8 m. 2 transiet P_3
 transiit P_8 m. 1 — 2 32: illo] P_8 illa *Mor* P_3 — ★ 34: praecipiat] *Mor* P_8 p̄cipit
 P_3 — x Chap. 14, 2: populi] *Mor* P_3 m. 2 in ras. (m. 1 = in populo) P_8 (in ante
 populi erasum est) — x 3: esset] *Mor* P_3 m. 2 + ihs P_3 P_8 m. 1 (nunc expunctum est)
 — x 4: ungenti] P_3 P_8 m. 1 unguenti *Mor* P_8 m. 2 — ★ 5: unguentum] P_3 unguen-
 tum *Mor* P_8 — 2 8: haec] *Mor* P_3 hoc P_8 m. 1 (hec m. 2) — 8: ungere] *Mor* P_3
 P_8 m. 1 (m. 2 ungere) — ★ 8: sepulturam] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 1 sepultura P_3 P_8 m. 2 —
 x 9: fecit haec] *Mor* haec fecit P_3 feçit haec P_8 (signa inversionis m. 1) — 2 13:
Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 in ras. (m. 1 de) — 13: baiulans] P_8 m. 2 in ras. portans *Mor* P_3
 — 2 19: ei] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — 2? 20: mecum] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 in ras.
 (cf. manum in aliis mss.) — x 21: traditur] *Mor* tradetur P_3 trad&ur P_8 — ★ 21:
 est] P_3 erat *Mor* P_8 — ? 25: genimine] *Mor* P_3 P_8 (+ ras. = ius) — ? 25:
 vitis] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 in ras. — 2? 27: scandalizabimini] *Mor* P_3 P_8 (+ ras. = in
 me) — 32: tibi] *Mor* P_3 (in ras.) P_8 — 2? 36: quod] *Mor* P_3 /q̄ōt (q̄ō in ras.
 m. 2) P_8 — ★ 38: promptus] promptus P_3 prumptus *Mor* prũptus P_8 — 43:
 turba multa] P_8 m. 2 turba *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 1 — 43: a (scribis)] P_8 m. 2 om. *Mor* P_3
 P_8 m. 1 — ? 44: ducite caute] P_3 caute ducite *Mor* c̄aute dũcite (signa inversionis
 sine multo dubio m. 1; u sec. m. 2) P_8 — ★ 51: eum] P_3 P_8 (e m. 2 in ras.; m. 1 illum)
 illum *Mor* — ★ 53: conveniunt] *Mor* P_3 convenerunt P_3 — x 54: usque] P_3 P_8
 + intro *Mor* — x 55: vero] P_3 P_8 om. *Mor* — 2 57: surgentes] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2
 surgens P_8 m. 1 — x 58: dissolvam] P_3 P_8 dissolvo *Mor* — 2 60: Iesum] *Mor* P_3
 eum P_8 — 2 61: rursum] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (m. 1 rursus) — ★ 61: dicit] *Mor* P_8
 m. 1 dixit P_3 P_8 m. 2 — ★ 61: Benedicti] *Mor* P_8 di benedicti P_3 — x 63: desi-
 deramus] P_3 P_8 desideremus *Mor* — 69: rursus] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 1 (nunc rursũ) —
 ★ Chap. 15, 4: interrogavit] *Mor* P_8 interrogabat P_3 — ★ 15: tradidit] P_3 + eis
Mor P_8 — x 16: in atrium] P_3 P_8 intro in atrium *Mor* — 2 21: Alexandri] *Mor*
 P_3 P_8 m. 2 (m. 1 Alexandrie) — 2 26: Et erat] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (m. 1 erat) — ★ 28:
 reputatus] P_3 deputatus *Mor* P_8 — ★ 34: lama] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 lema P_3 P_8 m. 2 —
 ★? 34: sabacthani] P_3 P_8 m. 2 in ras. zaptani *Mor* — ★ 38: sursum] P_3 P_8 m. 2
 summo *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — ? 40: quas et] quas erat *Mor* P_3 P_8 (?) — 2 46: monu-
 mento] *Mor* P_3 monumentũ P_8 — ★ Chap. 16, 3: revolvit] *Mor* P_3 m. 2 P_8 m. 1
 revolvit P_3 m. 1 P_8 m. 2 — 2 4: vident] P_8 vider- *Mor* viderunt P_3 — 2 5:
 obstipuerunt] P_8 obstupuerunt *Mor* P_3 — ? 7: ite] *Mor* P_8 (+et, nunc erasum)
 +et P_3 — 2? 10: qui cum] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 in ras. — ★ 14: viderant] P_3 P_8 m. 2
 viderunt *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — ★ 14: crediderant] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 crediderãnt (v m. 1?) P_3
 crediderunt P_8 m. 2 — 15: eis] P_8 (+ras. = sine multo dubio ihs) ihs *Mor* P_3 —
 ★ 18: eos] P_3 eis *Mor* P_8 — x 19: quidem] *Mor* + ihs P_3 P_8 — 2 Explicit
 Evangelium secundum Marcum] *Mor* (Explicuit, etc.) + hãb veřs N̄ tðCC P_3 + V̄
 I DCC P_8

Argumentum Lucae:

Praefatio vel Argumentum Lucae] Incipit argumentum in Evangelio Lucae *Mor*
 inẽ prolog̃ in Ev̄g̃l̃ Lũc P_3 Inẽpt̃ prologus P_8 — ★ p. 269, 2: confessionem eius] con-

sessionem P_3 passionem eius *Mor* P_8 — $\text{J} ? 3$: uxorem umquam] *Mor* + quā P_8 (?) uxorem quā P_3 — x 3: et] P_3 P_8 om. *Mor* — $\text{J} 8$: ea] *Mor* P_3 eam P_8 — x p. 270, 1: manifestata] *Mor* manifesta P_3 P_8 — $\star 2$: neve] *Mor* m. 1 P_8 ne vel *Mor* m. 2 P_3 — $\text{J} 4$: et in quo electus scriberet] *Mor* P_8 (*sine* et) om. P_3 (*homoeoteleuton*) — $\star 4$: scriberet *sec.*] *Mor* P_8 + $\bar{\text{p}}\bar{\text{s}}\bar{\text{u}}\bar{\text{p}}\bar{\text{t}}$ a cui evangl'm P_3 (*dittographia*) — $\star 5$: contestans] *Mor* P_8 contestantis P_3 — $\star 6$: et] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 om. P_3 P_8 m. 2 — $\text{J} ? 8$: Nathan] *Mor* P_3 natham P_8 (m a m. 2?) — $\text{J} 10$: redire] P_8 rediret *Mor* P_3 — x p. 271, 1: electionis] P_3 P_8 electione *Mor* — $\star 3$: stimulus] *Mor* P_8 stimulū P_3 — $\text{J} 3$: recalcitrantem] *Mor* P_3 calcitrantem P_8 — $\text{J} ? 5$: oporteat] *Mor* P_8 m. 2 *in ras.* oportet P_3 — $\star 6$: tam] *Mor* P_8 tantū P_3 — $\star 6$: demonstrare] om. *Mor* P_8 demonstrasse P_3 — $\star 7$: prodidisse] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 prodesse P_3 P_8 m. 2 — $\text{J} 8$: Explicit] + praefatio Lucae *Mor* Explicuit prōlg in evāg lucae P_3 Explicit p̄fatio P_8

Luke:

Evangelium secundum Lucam] In̄c̄pt Evḡl seōd Lucā *Mor* In̄c̄ Evḡl Lūc P_3 In̄c̄pt evangeliī secundum Lucam P_8 — $\star ?$ Chap. 1, 3: omnibus] P_3 P_8 (b; *in ras.* m. 2) omnia *Mor* — $\text{J} 6$: Domini] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — $\star 8$: fungeretur] *Mor* P_8 + Zacharias P_3 — $\text{J} ? 15$: Domino] *Mor* P_3 dNō (No *in ras.* m. 2) P_8 — $\star 15$: sicera] *Mor* P_8 sicerā P_3 — $\text{J} 26$: Deo] *Mor* P_3 dō (o *in ras.* m. 2) P_8 — $\text{J} 29$: vidisset] *Mor* m. 1 P_3 audisset *Mor* m. 2 P_8 — $\text{J} ? 30$: enim] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — $\text{J} 36$: quae] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 qui P_8 m. 1 — $\text{J} 38$: illa] *Mor* P_3 ea P_8 — $\text{J} 43$: hoc] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 *in ras.* — $\text{J} ? 45$: credidit] P_3 P_8 m. 2 (credidis? m. 1) credidisti *Mor* — $\star 45$: ei] P_3 P_8 m. 2 om. *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — $\text{J} 49$: qui] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (m. 1) quae] — $? 54$: memorari] *Mor* P_3 *in ras.* memori P_8 m. 1 (memore? m. 2) — $\star 56$: in] *Mor* P_8 om. P_3 — $\star 64$: illico] *Mor* m. 2 P_3 P_8 m. 2 illico *Mor* m. 1 P_8 m. 1 — $\star ? 67$: Spiritu] P_3 P_8 m. 2 *in ras.* sp̄s *Mor* — $\text{J} 80$: deserto] *Mor* P_3 desertis P_8 — x 80: in] P_3 P_8 ad *Mor* — \star Chap. 2, 1: describeretur] P_3 P_8 m. 2 discriberetur *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — $\star 2$: descriptio] P_3 P_8 m. 2 discriptio *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — x 2: praeside] *Mor* a praeside P_3 P_8 — $? 5$: praegnate] *Mor* pregnante P_3 praegnante P_8 — $\star ? 7$: praesepio] P_3 P_8 (io m. 2 *in ras.*) praesepe *Mor* — x 7: eis] *Mor* P_8 m. 2 ei P_3 P_8 m. 1 — $\star 12$: praesepio] P_3 P_8 m. 2 p̄sepe *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — x 13: (pax) in] P_3 P_8 om. *Mor* — $\star 15$: Dominus ostendit] P_3 P_8 m. 2 fecit dñs et ostendit *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — $\star 16$: praesepio] P_3 P_8 m. 2 praesepe *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — $\star 26$: ab] P_3 a *Mor* P_8 — $\star 42$: in] P_3 P_8 m. 2 om. *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — $\text{J} 44$: notos] *Mor* natos P_3 notus P_8 — $\star 46$: interrogantem] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 1 + eos P_8 m. 2 — $\star 52$: et (aetate)] P_3 om. *Mor* P_8 — J Chap. 3, 1: tetrarcha pr.] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 tetarcha P_8 m. 1 (*sic solet* P_8) — $\star 2$: Dei] *Mor* P_8 dñi P_3 — $\star 4$: Esaiāe] P_3 P_8 m. 2 Isaiāe *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — $\text{J} 5$: planas] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 plenis P_8 m. 1 — x 8: de] P_3 P_8 ex *Mor* — $\star 9$: radicem] P_3 P_8 m. 2 radices *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — $\star 9$: fructum] P_3 + bonum *Mor* P_8 — x 13: quam] P_3 P_8 q̄ q̄uod (*vestigis litterae q̄ secundae a m. 1 firmatis?*) *Mor* — $\text{J} ? 13$: faciat] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 facitis P_8 m. 1 — $\star 14$: eum] P_3 P_8 m. 2 illum *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — $\star 16$: venit autem] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 veniet autem P_3 venite enī P_8 m. 2 — 18: populum] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 1 populo P_8 m. 2 — x 25: Esli] P_3 P_8 Hesli *Mor* — $\star 26$: Iosech] ioseph *Mor* P_8 ioseth P_3 — $\star 26$: Ioda] *Mor* m. 2 P_3 P_8 m. 2 Iuda *Mor* m. 1 P_8 m. 1 — $\star 28$: Helmadam] P_3 helmodam *Mor* P_8 — (N.B. P_8 deest a 3, 35, in medio, usque ad 7, 23, in medio.) — 37: Iared] P_3 iareth *Mor* — 37: Malelehel] maleleel *Mor* malaleel P_3 — Chap. 4, 1: ab] *Mor* a P_3 — 1: desertum] *Mor* deserto P_3 —

4: vivet] *Mor* vivit P_3 — 6: illa] *Mor* illā P_3 — 17: Esaiæ] P_3 Isaiæ *Mor* — 18: misit me] *Mor* + sanare contristos corde P_3 — 18: dimittere] *Mor* demittere P_3 — 23: dicetis] P_3 dicitis *Mor* — 25: (facta) est] P_3 && *Mor* — 33: dicens] P_3 om. *Mor* — 35: illum] *Mor* eū P_3 — 39: dimisit] P_3 demisit *Mor* — Chap. 5, 1: cum] *Mor* quod P_3 — 2: stantes] P_3 om. *Mor* — 7: annuerunt] P_3 innuerunt *Mor* — 13: dicens] P_3 ihs dicens *Mor* — 16: secedebat] P_3 sedebat *Mor* — 19: illum] P_3 eum *Mor* — 24: tolle] P_3 & tolle *Mor* — 32: Non] P_3 non enim *Mor* — Chap. 6, 4: licet] licebat P_3 licebit (*in* licebat *versum* a m. 1) *Mor* — 7: observabant (autem)] *Mor* et observabant P_3 — 8: medium] *Mor* medio P_3 — 9: sabbato] *Mor* sabbatis P_3 — 15: Mattheum et Thomam] P_3 Thoman & Mattheū *Mor* — 18: venerunt] *Mor* venerant P_3 — 18: eum] P_3 illum *Mor* — 19: quarebant] quarebat *Mor* P_3 — 23: multa] +.ē. *Mor* P_3 — 26: prophetis] *Mor* pseudoprophetis P_3 — 28: vobis] vos *Mor* P_3 — 30: aufert] P_3 aufer& *Mor* — 35: nihil inde sperantes] *Mor* nihil desperantes P_3 — 37: dimittemini] P_3 demitt&ur *Mor* (*i suprascripta* a m. 1?) — 38: bonam] *Mor* +et P_3 — 38: quippe] *Mor* vero P_3 — 39: cadent] cadunt *Mor* P_3 — 40: sicut] si sit sicut *Mor* P_3 — 42: Et quomodo potes] *Mor* Aut quomodo poteris P_3 — 45: de malo] *Mor* +thesauro P_3 — 46: autem] *Mor* enim P_3 — 47: (cui similis) sit] *Mor* .ē. P_3 — 49: audivit] *Mor* audit P_3 — 49: fecit] *Mor* facit P_3 — 49 et (continuo)] P_3 om. *Mor* — 49: et (continuo)] P_3 om. *Mor* — 49: cecidit] *Mor* concidit P_3 — Chap. 7, 3: salvaret] P_3 sanar& *Mor* — 7: verbo] P_3 verbum *Mor* — 12: et (ecce)] P_3 om. *Mor* — 13: (super) ea] *Mor* eam P_3 — 18: Iohanni] P_3 Iohannē *Mor* — 19: Dominum] P_3 ihm *Mor* — 22: nuntiate] P_3 renuntiate *Mor* — (N.B. P_8 , qui a 3, 35 deest, textum 7, 23, medium, resumit.) — ★ 23: quicumque] *Mor* P_8 qui P_3 — 24: de Iohanne ad turbas] *Mor* P_3 ad turbas de Iohanne P_8 — ★ 25: deliciis] P_3 in deliciis *Mor* P_8 — ★ 32: tibiis] P_3 P_8 m. 2 om. *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — 33: panem] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 panes P_8 m. 1 — ★ 36: rogabat] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 rogavit P_3 P_8 m. 2 — ★ ? 37: accubuit] P_3 P_8 (it m. 2 in ras.) accubuiss& *Mor* — x 37: in domo] *Mor* P_3 in domum *Mor* — 37: ungenti] *Mor* P_3 ungenti P_8 (*hanc orthographiam adhibere solet* P_8) — 38: ungento ungebat] *Mor* P_3 ungento ungebat P_8 m. 1 ungento ungebat P_8 m. 2 — ★ 39: dicens] P_3 om. *Mor* P_8 — ★ 39: qualis] P_3 +.ē. *Mor* +ē P_8 m. 1 (*erasit* m. 2) — 39: mulier] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 1 ess& P_8 m. 2 — ★ 41: quingentos] P_3 P_8 m. 2 +& *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — x 47: remittentur] *Mor* remittunt² P_3 remittuntur P_8 — x 47: dimittitur] P_3 P_8 demittitur *Mor* — ★ Chap. 8, 1: civitatem et castellum] P_3 civitates & castella *Mor* P_8 m. 1 civitates & castellū P_3 m. 2 — 2: exierant] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 exierunt P_8 m. 1 — ★ 3: eis] P_3 ei *Mor* P_8 — 4: properarent] *Mor* P_3 properent P_8 — ★ 10: Dei] *Mor* P_8 om. P_3 — 12: sunt] sunt hii sunt *Mor* hi s̄ P_3 sunt hi sunt P_8 — 14: referunt] P_8 fer̄ *Mor* P_3 — x 15: patientia] P_8 pacientia P_3 pacientiam *Mor* — ★ 19: ad] *Mor* P_8 om. P_3 — ★ 20: te videre] P_3 videre te *Mor* P_8 — x 21: eos] P_3 P_8 illos *Mor* — 23: obdormivit] P_3 P_8 m. 2 obdormiit *Mor* obdormit P_8 m. 1 — 27: in domo] *Mor* P_3 in domu P_8 — ★ 30: intraverunt] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 intraverant P_3 P_8 m. 2 — x 31: eum] *Mor* illum P_3 P_8 — 32: illis] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (illos m. 1) — ★ 38: dimisit] P_3 P_8 m. 2 demisit *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — x 40: enim] P_3 P_8 autem *Mor* — ★ 42: Et contigit] *Mor* P_3 contigit aut̄ P_8 — x 49: illo] P_3 P_8 eo *Mor* — 49: venit] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 1 +quidā P_8 m. 2 — x 49: mortua est filia tua] P_3 P_8 filia tua mortua .ē. *Mor* — ★ ? 51: domum] P_8 P_3 (*ante* domum, *ad erasum est*) ad domum *Mor* — ★ 51: et Iohannem et Iacobum] *Mor* P_8 et

iacobū et iohannem P_3 — 52: est mortua] P_3 +rasura (= puella) P_8 enim mortua puella Mor — x 56: stupuerunt] P_3 P_8 obstupuerunt Mor — ★? 56: ne alicui] Mor ne cui P_3 ne +ras. (= cūi?) P_8 — ★ 56: erat] Mor P_8 fuerat P_3 — ★ Chap. 9, 5: receperint] P_3 P_8 m. 2 receperit Mor P_8 m. 1 — ★ 6: per] P_3 p P_8 m. 2 om. Mor P_8 m. 1 — 9: audio ego talia] Mor ego audio talia P_3 ego talia audio P_8 m. 2 in marg. inf. (m. 1 om.) — x 10: locum desertum] P_3 P_8 desertum locum Mor — ★ 10: Bethsaida] Mor P_8 m. 1 bethsaidae P_3 b&hsaidae P_8 m. 2 — ★ 11: cura] P_3 +ras. (= m) P_8 curam Mor — 12: dimitte] Mor P_3 demitte P_8 (sic P_8 fere semper) — ★ 15: discumbere fecerunt] Mor P_8 m. 1 (nunc erasum) discubuerunt P_3 P_8 m. 2 — ★ 16: illis] Mor P_8 m. 1 illos P_3 P_8 m. 2 — ★? 17: cophini duodecim] P_3 duodecim cophini Mor xii cōphini (signa inversionis m. 2, ut videtur) P_8 — 18: erant] Mor P_3 +auf P_8 — x 18: illos] P_3 P_8 eos Mor — 24: illam] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 eam P_8 m. 1 — x 25: lucretur universum mundum] P_3 P_8 mundum universum lucretur Mor — ★ 28: Et Iohannem et Iacobum] Mor P_8 et Iacobū et Iohannē P_3 — ★? 32: illo pr.] P_3 P_8 (+ras.) +erant Mor — ★ 37: illi] Mor P_8 illis P_3 — 45: interrogare eum] Mor interrogare illum P_3 eū interrogare +ras. (eū a m. 2) P_8 — 46: autem] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1 in fine lineae) — 47: eum] Mor P_3 illum P_8 m. 2 in ras. — 50: adversus] Mor P_3 adversum P_8 — x 51: dum] Mor P_8 m. 2 cum P_3 P_8 m. 1 — x 51: iret] Mor +in P_3 (m. 1, nunc erasum) P_8 — x 54: ignis descendat] P_3 P_8 descendat ignis Mor — 54: et (consumat)] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — ★? 55: et dixit] Mor dicens (et om.) P_3 P_8 m. 2 in ras. — x 58: nidos] P_3 P_8 tabernacula Mor — 58: caput] Mor P_3 +ras. (= suum) P_8 — 59: et] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 om. P_8 m. 1 — ★ 62: Ait] Mor P_8 Et ait P_3 — x Chap. 10, 4: nolite] Mor +ergo P_3 P_8 — ? 5: huic domui] P_3 domui huic Mor P_8 (cum signis inversionis — m. 1?) — 7: domo pr. et sec.] Mor P_3 domu P_8 — ? 9: qui] P_8 qui +ras. Mor quae P_3 — 10: receperint] P_8 (re in ras. m. 2) susceperint Mor P_3 — ★ 15: demergeris] Mor P_3 m. 1 dimergeris P_3 P_8 m. 2 — ? 20: quod] Mor P_3 quōd (d in ras. m. 2) P_8 — x 21: Pater, Domine] P_3 P_8 dñe pater Mor — 22: Patre] P_8 +meo Mor P_3 — ★ 23: quae] P_3 P_8 m. 2 +vos Mor P_8 m. 1 — 31: autem] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — ★ Chap. 11, 4: dimitte] P_3 P_8 m. 2 demitte Mor P_8 m. 1 — ★ 4: dimittimus] P_3 P_8 m. 2 demittimus Mor P_8 m. 1 — ★ 6: commoda] Mor P_8 quomoda P_3 — ★ 11: si] Mor P_8 om. P_3 — 17: desolatur] P_8 m. 2 desolabitur Mor P_3 P_8 m. 1 (bi nunc erasa) — ★ 17: cadet] Mor P_8 m. 1 cadit P_3 P_8 m. 2 — 18: me] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — 20: praevenit] P_8 pervenit Mor P_3 — ? 30: Ionas fuit] Mor (in ras., m. 1?) P_3 P_8 (cum signis inversionis .ç.ç a m. 1?) — 31: Salomone] P_8 quam salomon Mor quā salomon P_3 — 32: illam] Mor P_3 eam illā P_8 (Fortasse P_8 duas lectiones discordantes transscripsit ex codice qui ipsum antecedit.) — ★ 32: ad] P_3 P_8 m. 2 in Mor P_8 m. 1 — x 32: Iona] P_3 P_8 quam Ionas Mor — 34: si] Mor P_3 sin P_8 — ★ 36: totum lucidum fuerit] P_3 totum fuerit lucidum Mor P_8 m. 1 cum signis inversionis (ex: fuerit lucidum totū) — 40: de (intus)] Mor P_3 om. P_8 — 41: elemosynam] P_3 elymosinam Mor elymosynam P_8 — 42: Pharisaeis] P_3 P_8 m. 2 Pharisei Mor Pharisei P_8 m. 1 — 43: quia] Mor P_3 P_8 m. 2 qui P_8 m. 1 — ★ 44: quia] P_3 P_8 m. 2 qui Mor P_8 m. 1 — ★ 44: parent] Mor P_8 m. 1 apparent P_3 P_8 m. 2 — x 46: uno] P_3 P_8 om. Mor — ★ 47: quia] P_3 qui Mor P_8 — 52: quia tulistis] Mor P_3 qui titulis P_8 — ★ 52: ipsi] P_3 et ipsi Mor & ipsi P_8 — 52: non] Mor P_3 om. P_8 — ★ 52: introibant] Mor P_8 introiebant P_3 — x 54: insidiantes] Mor +ei P_3 P_8 — x Chap. 12, 2: autem] P_3 P_8 m. 1 (nunc erasum) om. Mor — x 3: aurem] P_3 P_8 aure Mor

— 8: in (me)] P_8 om. *Mor* P_3 — x 13: ei] P_3 P_8 om. *Mor* — ★ 18: congregabo omnia quae] *Mor* P_8 congregem fructus quae P_3 — 20: illi] *Mor* P_3 ras. (= ei) + illi P_8 (*Ex codice qui antecedit P_8 , ut videtur, duas lectiones discordantes iterum transscripsit.* Cf. 11, 32 supra.) — 23: (corpus) quam] *Mor* P_3 ras. (= plus) + quam P_8 — x 27: lilia] P_3 P_8 + agri *Mor* — 27: non (nent)] *Mor* P_3 P_8 (m. 1 neque?) — x 30: enim] P_3 P_8 autem *Mor* — ★ 33: elemosynam] P_3 P_8 m. 2 elymosinam *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — 41: ei] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — ★ 42: super] *Mor* P_8 supra P_3 — ★ 45: coeperit] *Mor* P_8 coepit P_3 — 48: (cognovit) et] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — ★? 49: nisi] P_3 + ut *Mor* + ras. (= ut) P_8 — ★ 52: in duo] *Mor* P_8 in duos P_3 — ★? 54: fit] P_3 P_8 (t in ras. m. 2) fi& *Mor* — ★? 56: terrae et caeli] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 (*cum signis inversionis a m. 1 vel 2*) caeli et terrae P_3 — 58: apud] *Mor* P_3 ad P_8 — x Chap. 13, 2: prae] P_3 P_8 cum *Mor* — ★ 2: peccatores fuerunt] *Mor* P_8 fuerunt peccatores P_3 — x 5: si non] P_3 P_8 nisi *Mor* — ★ 5: egeritis] P_3 P_8 m. 2 habueritis *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — ★ 12: vidisset] *Mor* P_8 videret P_3 — ★ 15: praesepio] P_3 P_8 m. 2 praesepi *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — ★ 24: quaerunt] *Mor P_8 quaerent P_3 — 25: et (incipietis)] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — 28: et (Isaac)] *Mor* P_3 om. P_8 — ★ 29: regno] *Mor* P_8 + dei P_3 — ★ 30: erunt bis] P_3 erant bis *Mor* P_8 — x 31: In] P_3 P_8 Et *Mor* — ★ 34: tertia] *Mor* P_8 + die P_3 — x 35: relinquitur] relinquetur P_3 P_8 reliquetur *Mor* — ? Chap. 14, 8: eo] *Mor* P_3 illo P_8 (in ras. m. 2) — 12: reinvitent] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 invitent P_8 m. 1 — ★ 14: habent] P_3 + unde *Mor* + ras. (= unde) P_8 — ★ 14: resurrectione] P_3 r&ributione *Mor* P_8 — ★? 18: ei] *Mor* illi P_3 P_8 in ras. m. 2 — ★? 24: gustabit] P_3 P_8 (*secunda t m. 2 in ras.*) gustabunt *Mor* — 26: meus discipulus esse] P_3 meus esse discipulus P_8 esse meus discipulus *Mor* — 27:] *Mor* P_3 om. *omnem verum* P_8 m. 1 (m. 2 add. in marg. inf.) — ★ 28: non] P_3 nonne *Mor* P_8 — ★ 28: habet] *Mor* P_8 habeat P_3 — ★ 31: non] P_3 nonne *Mor* P_8 — ★ Chap. 15, 4: dimittit] P_3 demittet *Mor* P_8 — ★ 5: inponit] P_8 m. 2 imponit P_3 inponet *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — ★ 7: habente] P_3 agente *Mor* P_8 — 8: accendit] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 accendent P_8 m. 1 — 18: caelum] *Mor* P_3 caelo P_8 — x 24: epulari] P_3 P_8 aepulare *Mor* — ★ 29: praeterii] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 praeterivi P_3 P_8 m. 2 — ? 32: At] P_3 et *Mor* ad P_8 m. 2 in ras. — 16, 1: et (ad)] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — 4: domos] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 1 domus P_8 m. 2 — x 7: alio] P_3 P_8 alii *Mor* — x 8: Edebant] *Mor* m. 2 P_3 P_8 & edebant *Mor* m. 1 — 9: vobis dico] *Mor* P_3 dico vobis P_8 — x 9: defeceritis] *Mor* deficeritis P_3 P_8 — 10: maiori bis] P_8 maiore *Mor* P_3 — x 15: abominatio] *Mor* abominatio P_3 P_8 — ★? 18: Omnis] P_3 et omnis *Mor* ras. (*fortasse &*) + omnis P_8 — x 21: ulcera] P_3 P_8 vulnera *Mor* — x 23: videbat] P_3 P_8 vidit *Mor* — ★ 24: aquam] *Mor* P_8 aqua P_3 — ★ 28: locum hunc] *Mor* P_8 hunc locū P_3 — 30: si] *Mor* P_3 om. P_8 — 17, 3: egerit] *Mor* P_3 agerit P_8 — ★ 5: Adaage] P_3 P_8 m. 2 auge *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — ★ 6: haberetis] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 habueritis P_3 P_8 m. 2 — ★ 7: arantem aut] P_3 + boves *Mor* + ras. (= boves) P_8 — ★? 7: dicet] dicat *Mor* dicit P_3 P_8 m. 2 (*sec. i m. 2 in ras.*) — ★ 8: dicet] P_3 P_8 m. 2 dicat *Mor* P_8 m. 1 — 26: et] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — ★ 27: uxores] P_3 & uxores *Mor* ras. (= &) + uxores P_8 — x 28: sicut] P_3 P_8 om. *Mor* — x 28: et (aedificabant)] *Mor* om. P_3 P_8 — 33: salvam facere] *Mor* P_3 salvare P_8 — x Chap. 18, 14: Dico] P_3 P_8 Amen dico *Mor* — x 15: quod] P_3 P_8 quos *Mor* — 18: faciens] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (faciam m. 1) — 22: caelo] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 in ras. (caelū m. 1) — x 29: filios] P_3 P_8 + aut agros *Mor* — ★? 30: venturo] P_3 P_8 (ven in ras. m. 2) futuro *Mor* — 33: die tertia] *Mor* P_3 t̄tia die P_8 — ? 34: et erat]*

$P_3 P_8 m. 2$ erat autē *Mor* erat autē $P_8 m. 1$ — $\text{J } 43$: vidit et] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ (*om. m. 1*) — ★ Chap. 19, 7: divertisset] P_3 devertisset *Mor* P_8 — ★ 8: dimidium] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ dimedium *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — ★ 13, 16 (*bis*), 18 (*bis*), 20, 24 (*bis*), 25: mnas, mna, mnam] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ minas, mina, minam *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — $\text{J } 15$: et (iussit)] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ (*om. m. 1*) — ? 19: supra] *Mor* P_3 sup (+*ras.*) P_8 — ★ 20: repositam] *Mor* P_8 positā P_3 — ★ 22: sum] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ sim *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — ★ ? 23: illud] $P_3 P_8$ (ud in *ras. m. 2*) illam *Mor* — ★ 30: umquam] *Mor* P_8 nūquā P_3 — ★ 31: operam] P_3 opera *Mor* P_8 — x 35: pullum] $P_3 P_8$ illum et *Mor* — $\text{J } 36$: eunte autem illo] P_3 euntem autem illum *Mor* euntem autem illo P_8 (*Ex codice qui praecedit P_8 duas lectiones inter se discordantes transscripsit. Cf. 11, 32 et 12, 20 supra.*) — $\text{J } 37$: discentium] *Mor* $m. 1$ (descentium $m. 2$) descendentiū $P_8 m. 1$ discipulorū P_3 discipuloꝝ $P_8 m. 2$ — ★ ? 37: quas] $P_3 P_8$ (s in *ras. m. 2*) quae *Mor* — 44: prosternent] $P_8 m. 2$ consternent *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 1$ — x 44: tuos] $P_3 P_8$ om. *Mor* — x Chap. 20, 3: unum] $P_3 P_8$ om. *Mor* — x 9: autem] $P_3 P_8$ om. *Mor* — $\text{J } 9$: multis] *Mor* P_3 om. P_8 — ★ 14: inter] *Mor* P_8 intra P_3 — ? 14: ut] *Mor* $m. 1$ P_3 et *Mor* $m. 2$ & P_8 — x 19: in (illa)] *Mor* om. $P_3 P_8$ — ★ 22: dare tributum] dari tributum P_3 tributum dare *Mor* P_3 — $\text{J } 23$: autem] *Mor* P_3 om. P_8 — $\text{J } ? 34$: nubunt] *Mor* $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ nubent $P_8 m. 1$ (nubent, 35, cum hoc verbo $P_8 m. 1$ confundit) — ★ 35: nubunt] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ nubent *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — ★ 35: ducunt] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ ducunt *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — ★ 43: scabellum] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ scabillum *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — x 46: a] $P_3 P_8$ ad *Mor* — ★ 47: accipient] P_3 percipient *Mor* P_8 — $\text{J } \text{Chap. } 21, 5$: quibusdam] *Mor* P_3 quidā P_8 — x 8: enim] $P_3 P_8$ om. *Mor* — x 8: ergo] $P_3 P_8$ om. *Mor* — $\text{J } 9$: audieritis] *Mor* P_3 videritis P_8 — $\text{J } 9$: non] *Mor* P_3 nondum P_8 — x 11: pestilentiae] $P_3 P_8$ pestilentia *Mor* — x 21: eam] $P_3 P_8$ ea *Mor* — x 23: praegnatibus] *Mor* praegnantibus P_3 p/reg/nantib; (/ /= *ras.*) P_8 — x 24: impleantur] $P_3 P_8$ conpleantur *Mor* — ★ 30: aestas . . . 31. prope est] *Mor* P_3 om. P_8 (*homoeoteuton*) — x Chap. 22, 2: eum] $P_3 P_8$ iħm *Mor* — $\text{J } ? 4$: et (locutus)] *Mor* P_3 om. P_8 — ★ 6: spondit] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ spondit *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — ★ 10: domum] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ domo *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — x ? 10: in quam] $P_3 P_8$ in qua *Mor* — x 18: enim] $P_8 P_3$ autem *Mor* — ? 19: commemorationem] *Mor* in *ras. P_3* commorationem P_8 (*cum Mor m. 1?*) — x ? 37: in me] $P_3 P_8$ de me *Mor* — x 38: satis] *Mor* sat $P_3 P_8$ — $\text{J } 49$: in (gladio)] *Mor* P_3 om. P_8 — 55: igni] *Mor* $m. 1$ P_3 igne *Mor* $m. 2$ P_8 — $\text{J } 60$: cantavit gallus] P_8 gallus cantavit *Mor* P_3 — x 63: eum] $P_3 P_8$ illum *Mor* — ★ 63: caedentes] $P_3 P_8 m. 2$ cedentes *Mor* $P_8 m. 1$ — ★ Chap. 23, 5: commovet] *Mor* P_8 commovit P_3 — x 9: at] $P_3 P_8$ & *Mor* — ★ 9: respondebat] *Mor* P_8 respondit (it in *ras.*) P_3 — x 10: etiam] $P_3 P_8$ autem *Mor* — $\text{J } 12$: in] *Mor* P_3 ex P_8 — $\text{J } 14$: et (ecce)] *Mor* P_3 om. P_8 — ★ 18: autem] *Mor* P_8 om. P_3 — ★ 27: lamentabantur] *Mor* P_8 lamentabuntur P_3 — ★ 29: qui] *Mor* P_8 quae P_3 — $\text{J } 35$: faciunt] *Mor* P_3 faciant P_8 — $\text{J } 38$: inscripta] P_8 scripta *Mor* P_3 — ★ 44: universa terra] P_3 universam terram *Mor* P_8 — $\text{J } 46$: voce magna Iesus] *Mor* P_3 ihs voce magna P_8 — ★ 47: fuerat] *Mor* P_8 erat P_3 — ★ 48: aderant] *Mor* P_8 erant P_3 — x 49: autem] *Mor* +et P_3 +& P_8 — x 50: ecce] $P_3 P_8$ haec *Mor* — x 55: autem mulieres] $P_3 P_8$ mulieres autem *Mor* — $\text{J } 56$: ungenta] *Mor* P_3 unguenta P_8 — ★ Chap. 24, 6: (locutus) est] P_3 sit *Mor* P_8 — 8: regressae] *Mor* $P_8 m. 2$ egressae P_3 gressae $P_8 m. 1$ — x 11: illis] $P_3 P_8$ illos *Mor* — ★ 12: posita] +sola P_3 sola posita *Mor* P_8 — ★ 16: eorum] *Mor* P_8 illorū P_3 — $\text{J } 20$: eum tradiderunt] *Mor* P_3 tradiderunt eum P_8 — x 24: viderunt] *Mor* invenerunt $P_3 P_8$ (*cf. invenerunt in linea superiori*) — 28: adpropinquaverunt] *Mor. m. 1*

(*fortasse*) appropinquaverunt P_3 adpropinquabant *Mor m.* 2 P_3 — $\text{J } 28$: ipse] P_8 + se *Mor P₃* — x 33: in] $P_3 P_8$ om. *Mor* — $\star 36$: autem] *Mor P₈ om. P₃* — x 36: eis] $P_3 P_8$ illis *Mor* — $\star 38$: ascendunt] *Mor P₈ ascendunt P₃* — $\text{J } 42$: piscis assi] *Mor P₃ assi piscis P₈* (*Ad inversiones P₈ frequenter inclinat; cf. multas inversiones a m. 1 correctas.*) — $? 44$: eos] $P_3 P_8 m.$ 2 in ras. illos *Mor in ras. P₈ m. 1* — $\star 51$: est] *Mor P₈ om. P₃* — $\star 53$: Amen] P_3 om. *Mor P₈* — \star Explicit Evangelium secundum Lucam] + \bar{v} iii dccc *Mor P₈* Explicuit Evangelium secundum Lucam • Habet ver̄s Num̄ III DCCC P_8

Argumentum Iohannis:

Praefatio vel Argumentum Iohannis] Incipit Argumentum in Evangelio Iohannis *Mor* Incipit Praef^{at} in Evanġl Ioh P_3 Incipit Praef^{at} Evanġlii sedē ioh P_8 — J p. 485, 2: quem *Mor P₃ quae P₈* — x p. 486, 1: ut] $P_3 P_8$ om. *Mor* — $\star 1$: erat ipse] P_3 ipse erat *Mor P₈* — $\text{J } 2$: ut] ac *Mor P₃ a P₈* — $\star 6-7$: incorruptibile principium in Genesi] *Mor P₈ om. P₃* — \star p. 487, 5: conlocato] collocata *Mor P₈ collocatio P₃* — $\text{J } 7$: Explicit Praefatio] om. *Mor* Explicuit praef in Evangelio Ioh P_3 Explicuit praef^{at} hieronimi prsbri P_8) —

John:

$\text{J } ?$ Evangelium secundum Iohannem] om. P_8 Inc̄pt evġl secundum Iohannem *Mor* Inc̄pt evangelium secundum Iohannem P_3 — \star Chap. 1, 8: de] *Mor P₈ om. P₃* — $\star 12$: receperunt eum] P_3 eū receperunt *Mor P₈* — x 15: vobis] *Mor om. P₃ P₈* — $\text{J } 21$: Et (dicit)] P_3 Qui *Mor P₃* — $\star 23$: Esaias] P_3 Isaias *Mor P₈* — 27: eius] *Mor P₃ P₈ m. 1 (erasum a m. 2)* — $\text{J } 29$: videt] *Mor P₃ vidit P₈* — $\star 42$: Iohanna] P_3 iona *Mor P₈* — 50: dixit] *Mor m. 1 P₃ P₈ dicit Mor m. 2* — $\text{J Chap. 2, 1 et 11: in cana}$ P_3 in chana *Mor in canan P₃* — x 9: non sciebat] $P_3 P_8$ nesciebat *Mor* — x 10: vinum (usque)] $P_3 P_8$ om. *Mor (homoeoteleuton)* — x 16: hinc] $P_3 P_8$ + et *Mor* — $\star ?$ Chap. 3, 2: Deus] P_3 dñs *Mor dñs (/ = ras.)* P_8 — $\star 16$: in eum] *Mor P₈ in ipso P₃* — $\star 17$: in mundum] *Mor P₈ om. P₃* — $\star 21$: eius opera] *Mor P₈ opera ei P₃* — $\star 27$: ei fuerit] P_3 fuerit ei *Mor P₈* — $\star 28$: quia] P_3 qñm *Mor P₈* — $\star 31$: supra] *Mor P₈ super P₃* — $\text{J } 32$ et 33: accipit] *Mor P₃ accepit P₈* — $\star 36$: in] *Mor P₈ om. P₃* — x Chap. 4, 5: ergo] $P_3 P_8$ autem *Mor* — $\text{J } 9$: illa] *Mor P₃ om. P₈* — $\text{J } 10$: donum] *Mor P₃ domum P₈* — x 13: sitiet] $P_3 P_8$ sitiat *Mor* — x 14: fiet] $P_3 P_8$ fiat *Mor* — $\star 17$: dicit] *Mor P₃ diŋ P₈* — $\star 21$: venit] P_3 veniet *Mor P₈* — x 29: venite] $P_3 P_8$ + et *Mor* — $\text{J } 36$: accipit] *Mor P₃ accepit P₈* — $\text{J } 36$: ut et] *Mor P₃ & ut P₈* — $\text{J } 38$: laborem] P_8 labores *Mor P₃* — $\star 42$: iam] *Mor P₈ om. P₃* — $\star 45$: in (diem)] P_3 ad *Mor P₈* — $\text{J } 46$: Et] *Mor P₃ om. P₈* — $\text{J } 53$: ergo] *Mor P₃ aut̄ P₈* — x 53: quod] *Mor quia P₃ P₈* — $\text{J Chap. 5, 1: Hierosolymis}$ *Mor hierosolymis P₈ hierosolymā P₃* — $\text{J } 5$: autem] *Mor P₃ om. P₈* — $\star 6$: habet] P_3 haberet *Mor P₈* — $\star 7$: hominem non habeo] *Mor P₈ non habeo hominem P₃* — x 13: enim] $P_3 P_8$ autem *Mor (cf. autem supra)* — x 13: turba constituta] turbam constitutam *Mor a turba constituta P₃ P₈* — $\text{J } 23$: Patrem] *Mor P₃ P₈ m. 2 (om. m. 1)* — $\star 24$: in (vitam)] P_3 ad *Mor P₈* — $\star 29$: procedent] *Mor P₈ procedunt P₃* — $\star 43$: accipitis] P_3 accepistis *Mor P₈* — x 45: accusat] *Mor accuset P₃ accus& P₈* — J Chap. 6, 1: est *Mor P₃ P₈ m. 2 (om. m. 1)* — x 11: panes Iesus] *Mor ihs panes P₃ P₈* — $\text{J } 13$: superfuerunt] *Mor P₃ superaverunt P₈* — x 13: manducaverunt] *Mor manducaverant P₃ P₈* — $\text{J } 21$: accipere eum in navem] P_3 in navi accipere eum *Mor in navem accipere eū P₃* — x 22: alia] $P_3 P_8$ om. *Mor* — $\star 24$: naviculas] *Mor P₈ in naviculas P₃* — $\text{J } 28$:

operemur] *Mor* P_3 operamur P_8 — 30: quid] P_3 quod *Mor* quā P_8 — 36: et (vidistis)] *Mor* P_3 om. P_8 — ★ 37: veniet] P_3 venit *Mor* P_8 — ★ 37: eiciam] P_3 eieciam *Mor* P_8 — ★ 45: Et (erunt)] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 om. P_3 P_8 m. 2 — x 46: is] P_3 P_8 om. *Mor* — x 52: carnem suam nobis] *Mor* nobis carnem suā P_3 P_8 — 53: habetis] *Mor* P_3 habebitis P_8 — ★ 69: credidimus] P_3 credimus *Mor* P_8 — ★ 71: Iudam] P_3 de Iuda *Mor* P_8 — ★ 71: Scariotis] scariothis *Mor* P_8 scariothen P_3 — ★ Chap. 7, 1: haec] *Mor* P_8 +aut P_3 — x 3: videant] *Mor* m. 2 P_3 P_8 vident *Mor* m. 1 — 7: est] P_8 //·è· (// = ad, nunc erasum) P_3 ad ·è· *Mor* — 8: non ascendo] P_3 enim non ascendam *Mor* non ascendam P_8 — ★ 12: de eo erat] P_3 erat de eo *Mor* P_8 — x 17: loquar] P_3 P_8 loquor *Mor* — ★ 26: Et (ecce)] *Mor* P_8 om. P_3 — ★ 29: scio eum] *Mor* P_8 +et si dixero quā nescio eū ero similis vob̄ m̄dax et scio eū P_3 — 32: apprehenderent] P_8 apprehenderent *Mor* apprehenderunt P_3 — x 32: turbam] P_3 P_8 turba P_8 — x 33: ergo] *Mor* +eis P_3 P_8 — x Chap. 8, 5: nobis] P_3 P_8 vobis *Mor* — x 10: ubi sunt] *Mor* +qui te accusabant P_3 P_8 — x 11: autem] P_3 P_8 +ei *Mor* — x 11: te] P_3 P_8 om. *Mor* — x 11: iam] P_3 P_8 om. *Mor* — 14: veni] *Mor* P_8 veniam P_8 — x 14: venio] P_3 P_8 veniam *Mor* — ★ 14: vado sec.] P_3 vadam *Mor* P_8 — 16: et (qui)] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — x 16: me misit] P_3 P_8 misit me *Mor* (homoeoteleuton) — 25: quia] P_8 qui *Mor* P_3 — 27: dicebat] *Mor* P_3 +d̄m P_8 — x 29: reliquit] *Mor* relinquit P_3 P_8 — 34: facit] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 fecit P_8 m. 1 — x 35: domo] P_3 P_8 domu *Mor* — ★ 50: iudicat] *Mor* P_8 iudicet P_3 — 1 Chap. 9, 5: sum mundi] *Mor* P_3 mundi sum P_8 — ★ 9: Ille] *Mor* P_8 +vero P_3 — ★ 10: oculi tibi] *Mor* P_8 tibi oculo P_3 — ★ 12: Dixerunt] *Mor* P_8 et dixerunt P_3 — ★ 16: quia] *Mor* P_8 m. 1 qui P_3 P_8 m. 2 — ★ Chap. 10, 3: educit] *Mor* P_8 educet P_3 — x 4: emisit] P_3 P_8 miserit *Mor* — 5: sequentur] P_8 sequuntur *Mor* secuntur P_3 (cf. sequuntur *supra*) — ★ 5: fugient] P_3 fugiunt *Mor* P_8 — ★ 8: eos] *Mor* P_8 eas P_3 — x 9: introierit] P_3 P_8 intraverit *Mor* — ★ 11: dat] P_3 in ras. ponit *Mor* P_8 — ? 11: ovis] P_3 in ras. P_8 +suis *Mor* — x 22: hiems] *Mor* P_8 hiemis P_3 P_8 — x 40: Et (abiit)] P_3 P_8 om. *Mor* — ★ Chap. 11, 1: sororis] P_3 sororum *Mor* P_8 — ★ 2: ungento] P_3 unguento *Mor* P_8 — ★ 3: sorores] *Mor* P_8 +eius P_3 — ★ 4: eam] P_3 eum *Mor* P_8 — 9: horae sunt] *Mor* P_3 sunt horae P_8 — x 11: hoc] P_3 P_8 haec *Mor* — 13: dormitione] *Mor* P_3 dormitatione P_8 — ★ 18: Hierosolyma] P_3 hierosolymam *Mor* P_8 — 24: in (resurrectione)] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) — x 27: mundum] *Mor* hunc mundum P_3 P_8 — ★ 29: surgit] P_3 surrex̄ *Mor* surrexit P_8 — x 31: domo] P_3 P_8 domu *Mor* — x 31: surrexit] P_3 P_8 surrexit *Mor* — x 33: ut vidit] P_3 P_8 videns *Mor* — ★ 33: fremuit] P_3 infremuit *Mor* P_8 — x 37: moreretur] P_3 P_8 moriretur *Mor* — x 46: eis] P_3 P_8 eos *Mor* — 48: eum pr.] *Mor* P_3 illū P_8 — x 52: et (ut)] *Mor* om. P_3 P_8 — 56: veniat] P_8 venit *Mor* veniet P_3 — ★ Chap. 12, 4: Scariotis] Scariothes *Mor* P_8 Scariothis P_3 — 5: veniit] P_3 venit *Mor* vendit P_8 — x 7: diem] P_3 P_8 die *Mor* — 8: habetis pr.] *Mor* P_3 habebitis P_8 — x 9: est] P_3 P_8 && *Mor* — ★ 12: audissent] P_3 audisset *Mor* P_8 — x 16: erant] P_3 P_8 erat *Mor* — 19: ergo] *Mor* P_3 aut P_8 — ★ 22: Andreas] P_3 et Andreas *Mor* P_8 — x 22: rursum] P_3 P_8 autem *Mor* — ★ 22: dicunt] P_3 dixerunt *Mor* P_8 — x 23: eis] P_3 P_8 ei *Mor* — ★ 27: salvifica me] P_3 salvum me fac *Mor* P_8 — ★ 38: Esaias] P_3 Isaias *Mor* P_8 — ★ 39 et 41: Esaias] P_3 Isaias *Mor* P_8 — 42: et (ex)] *Mor* P_3 om. P_8 — x 46: omnis] P_3 P_8 omnes *Mor* — ★ 47: salvificem] P_3 salvum faciam *Mor* P_8 — ★ 48: ille] *Mor* P_8 om. P_3 — 1 Chap. 13, 1: mundo sec.] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (mundum

m. 1) — ? 2: misisset] inmisisset *Mor* se immisisset *P₃* inmiss& *P₈* — ★ 2: Scariotis] Scariothes *Mor P₈* Scariothis *P₃* — ★ 5: mittit] misit *Mor P₈* demisit *P₃* — x 8: Iesus ei] Iesus *Mor* ei ihs *P₃* *P₈* — ★ 10: indiget] *P₃ m. 1* + nisi pedes *Mor P₃ m. 2 P₈* — 14: pedes vestros] *P₈* vestros pedes *Mor* pedes *P₃* — ★ 26: Scariotis] scariothi *Mor P₈* scariothis *P₃* — ★ 32: clarificabit bis] *P₃* clarificavit *Mor P₈* — x 37: te sequi] *Mor* sequi te *P₃ P₈* — ★ 38: ponis] *P₃* pones *Mor P₈* — ★ 38: neges] *Mor P₈* + et ait discipulis suis *P₃* — x Chap. 14, 2: domo] *P₃ P₈* domu *Mor* — 2: mansiones multae] *Mor P₃* multae mansōnes *P₈* (*sic!*) — ★ 6: et (veritas)] *P₃ om. Mor P₈* — ★ 9: vidit bis] *Mor P₈* videt *P₃* — 10: credis] *Mor P₃* creditis *P₈* — 10: est] *Mor P₃* ēē *P₈* — ★ 14: me] *Mor P₈ om. P₃* — ★ 16: Paracletum] *Mor P₈* paraclitū *P₃* — 17: videt] *P₈* vidit *Mor P₃* — ★ 17: cognoscitis] *P₃* cognoscetis *Mor P₈* — ★ 21: diligetur] *P₃* diligitur *Mor P₈* — ★ 22: Scariotis] scariothes *Mor P₈* scariothis *P₃* — ★ 22: te ipsum] *Mor P₈ om. P₃* — ★ 23: diliget] *P₃* diligit *Mor P₈* — ★ 24: sermonem] *Mor m. 2 P₃* sermo *Mor m. 1 P₈* — ★ Chap. 15, 5: fert] *P₃* affert *Mor P₈* — ★ 6: si] *P₃* et si *Mor P₈* — ★ 6: mittetur] *Mor P₈* mittitur *P₃* — ? 6: eos] *Mor (m. 2 vel m. 1 corr.) P₈* eum (?) *Mor m. 1* eū *P₃* — ★ 6: mittunt] *Mor P₈* mittent *P₃* — ★ 6: ardent] *Mor P₈* ardet *P₃* — 9: mea] *Mor P₃* + sicut & ego *P₈* — ★ 13: hac] *P₃* hanc *Mor P₈* — ★ 15: quia] *Mor P₈* sed *P₃* — 15: amicos] *Mor P₃* + meos *P₈* — 16: fructum adferatis] fructum afferatis *Mor P₈* afferatis fructū *P₈* — 16: det vobis] *Mor P₃ om. P₈* — ★ 18: vobis odio] *Mor P₈* odio vos *P₃* — ★ 20: servaverunt] *P₃* servaverint *Mor P₈* — 25: odio me habuerunt] *Mor* odio habuer̃ me *P₃* oder̃ *P₈* — 27: perhibetis] *Mor P₃* phibebitis *P₈* — ★ Chap. 16, 2: venit] *P₃* veniet *Mor P₈* — x 7: Paracletus] *Mor* paraclytus *P₃ P₈* — ★ 9: credunt] *P₃* crediderunt *Mor P₈* — 14: clarificabit] *Mor P₃* clarificavit *P₈* — 17: ex discipulis eius ad invicem] *Mor P₃ om. P₈* — 17: nobis] *Mor P₃ om. P₈* — 17: et non videbitis me . . . 18. quod dicit, Modicum] *Mor P₃ om. P₈* (*homoeoteleuton*) — 21: (natus) est] *Mor P₃ om. P₈* — x 22: habetis] *P₃ P₈* habebitis *Mor* — 23: rogabitis] *Mor P₃* interrogabitis *P₈* — ★ Chap. 17, 5: claritate] *Mor P₈* claritatē *P₃* — x 12: perivit] *P₃ P₈* periit *Mor* — ★ 18: sicut] *P₃* + tu *Mor P₈* — 22: illis] *P₈* eis *Mor P₃* — x 22: sicut] *P₃ P₈* + et *Mor* — ★ 23: et (cognoscat)] *Mor P₈* ut *P₃* — 23: et (me)] *Mor P₃ om. P₈* — x Chap. 18, 3: Pharisaeis] *P₃ P₈* pharisaei *Mor* — 3: illuc] *Mor P₃* illic *P₈* — x 11: gladium] *P₃ P₈* + tuum *Mor* — ★ 13: enim] *P₃* autē *Mor* aut̃ *P₈* — x 16: exivit] *P₃ P₈* exiit *Mor* — ★ 23: caedis] *P₃* cedis *Mor P₈* — ★ 26: Dicit] *Mor P₈* + ei *P₃* — 28: a Caiapha in praetorium] a caiphan in praetorium *Mor* ad caiphan in praetorium *P₃* in p̃toriū a caipha *P₈* — ★ 29: adfertis] defertis *Mor P₈* affertis *P₃* — 36: mundo hoc] *P₈* hoc mundo *Mor P₃* — 39: (consuetudo) vobis] *P₃ om. Mor P₈* — x 39 et 40: dimittam] *P₃ P₈* demittam *Mor* — 1 Chap. 19, 4: iterum] *Mor P₃* + eū *P₈* — x 10 et 12: dimittere (*bis*), dimittis] *P₃ P₈* demittere, demittis *Mor* — x 13: locum] *Mor* loco *P₃ P₈* — x 15: dixit] *P₃ P₈* dicat *Mor* — x 26: et] *P₃ P₈ om. Mor* — ★ 29: spongiam] spongeam *Mor P₈* sphongiam *P₃* — 35 et verum est eius testimonium] *Mor P₃ om. P₈* *m. 1* & verū est testimonium eius *add. P₈ m. 2 in marg. inf.* — 39: et (Nicodemus)] *Mor P₃ om. P₈* — ★ 40: mos Iudaeis est] *Mor P₈* mos .ē. Iudaeis .ē. *P₃* (*sic!*) — 42: monumentum] *Mor P₃ P₈ m. 1* + ubi *P₈ m. 2* — ★ Chap. 20, 1: videt] *Mor P₈* vidit *P₃* — 13: illi] *Mor P₃ om. P₈* — x 15: esset] *P₃ P₈* .ē. *Mor* — 15: tu] *Mor P₃ om. P₈* — 17: vade] *Mor P₃ P₈ m. 2* vado *P₈ m. 1* — x 19: medio] *P₃ P₈* + eorū *Mor* — x 19: dicit] *P₃ P₈* dixit *Mor* — ★ 25: fixuram]

Mor P_8 figurā P_3 —★ 31: vitam] P_3 +aeternam *Mor* P_8 —★ Chap. 21, 1: iterum Iesus] P_3 ihs iterū *Mor* P_8 —★ 3: in navem] P_3 P_8 m. 2 in nave *Mor* P_8 m. 1 —x 4: litore] P_3 littore P_8 litorem *Mor* —x 6: ergo] P_3 P_3 +retia *Mor* —▷ 6: iam] P_8 om. *Mor* P_3 —★ 9: cubitis] *Mor* P_8 accubitis P_3 —x 9: in terram] P_3 P_8 a terra *Mor* —▷ 12: eum] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 2 (om. m. 1) —14: discipulis] *Mor* P_3 P_8 m. 1 +suis P_8 m. 2 —▷ 16: me] *Mor* P_3 +plus his P_8 —x 19: hoc cum] *Mor* cū hoc P_3 P_8 —x 20: tradit] P_3 P_8 tradet *Mor* —▷ 23: si (sic)] *Mor* P_8 om. P_3 —★ 25: Iesus] *Mor* P_8 +quia P_3 —▷ 25: Amen] om. *Mor* P_3 do gratias amen P_8 —★ Explicit Evangelium secundum Iohannem] *Mor* P_8 Explicuit Evangelii secundum iohannem Habet vers Numr .I.DCC P_3

V. THE NATURE AND GENEALOGY OF PARIS 8847

It is now time to assemble the information we have discovered in the collations above concerning the nature and antecedents of P_8 . We should remember at the start, of course, that the text of P_8 belongs definitely to the Turonian tradition.⁸⁷ We would know now the particular branch of this tradition (pre-Alcuinian, A. T., N. E., etc.) to which P_8 belongs.

Fortunately the evidence is full. First of all, P_8 agrees most often with *Mor* against P_3 (these cases are marked by a star: ★). Second, P_8 agrees fairly often with P_3 against *Mor* (these cases are marked by a cross: x). Third, P_8 is sometimes independent of both *Mor* and P_3 (these cases are marked by the symbol ▷). Fourth and finally, P_8 is frequently corrected by the second hand to P_3 . Here, then, is a most interesting state of affairs. Our manuscript is not only not pre-Alcuinian or even Alcuinian (A. T.) in text, but it is later than the beginning of the new edition (N. E.).

⁸⁷ There is proof in the readings in which *Mor*, P_3 , and P_8 all agree against all the important non-Turonian families — the Irish (*DELQRZ*), the Northumbrian (*AY*), and the Theodulfian (*ΘH*). (Cf. p. 173 below). Such readings I have not listed among my variants, since my interest there has been not to distinguish the Turonian text from others, but to set down the readings in which P_8 differs from *Mor* or P_3 or both. I present below, however, several examples of readings characteristic of the Turonian text, readings in which *Mor*, P_3 , and P_8 all agree against non-Turonian families: Mark, 5, 35: ab archisynagogo] ad archisynagogum (with *KW*); 6, 32: in navi] in navem (with *CIK MTTVWX*Z³*); 8, 19: quot] et quot (quod P_3); 13, 2: has omnes magnas] magnas has omnes (with *KV*); 14, 13: laguenam] lagoenam (with *BEPJMTOT*); Luke, 16, 21: divitis] + et nemo illi dabat (*nunc eras. P₈*) (with *KTW*); 21, 13: continget] P_8 m. 2 contingit (contigit *Mor*); John, 7, 39: non enim] nondum (+ enim? *Mor*); 13, 2: corde] cor (with *CIKO^c TVW*); 19, 36: impleatur] impleretur (with *IKTVW*).

To amplify still further the description of our manuscript's history let us now consider the source of the so-called 'independent' readings mentioned above. I list below all the readings of this sort in P_8 (other than obvious independent errors) and I note in each instance what other manuscripts among those reported by Wordsworth and White in their larger edition agree with P_8 .⁸⁸

Epistula ad Damasum: (p. 1, 8: clamans] clamitans KVP_8 m. 1)
 p. 2, 18: haec] hoc P_8 $AH\Theta K V Y_{aur}$.
Plures fuisse: p. 13, 4: ita facturum] P_8 codd. praeter $EK\overline{MTM}$ Mor P_3
Argumentum Matthaei: 15, 1: ponitur] P_8 m. 1 codd. praeter $C\overline{APH}$
 Mor P_3
 p. 16, 1: sicque] sitque P_8 $BEM\overline{TZ}$
Matthew: Ch. 1, 22: id] om. P_8 $CDE\overline{FP}FJL\overline{MT}RTVWXZ$
 2, 22: illuc] illo P_8 $CJK\overline{MT}VWX^*Z$
 4, 12: audisset] +ihs P_8 $EKL\overline{MT}QRVWZ$
 8, 20: tabernacula] nidos P_8 $ACH\Theta K\overline{MT}VWX^c$ (in ras.) Y
 9, 5: peccata] +tua P_8 $DE\overline{FP}^{m_0}H\Theta K\overline{MT}QTV$
 13, 15: enim] om. P_8 T
 13, 35: dictum erat] P_8 $AC\overline{FP}^1FHL\overline{MTY}$
 14, 1: audiit] audivit P_8 $BDE\overline{FP}KLM\overline{TO}^2QRTVWZ^4$
 14, 10: Iohannem] Iohannen P_8 $KM\overline{TOZ}$
 14, 18: illos mihi huc] huc illos mihi P_8 $KM\overline{TVZ}$
 15, 28: illius] eius P_8 $B\overline{EP}JKM\overline{TO}^*TVWXZ$
 15, 35: discumberet] discumberent P_8 $E\overline{FP}H^1\Theta JLM\overline{T}QRTWX^*Z^3$
 15, 38: manducaverant] manducaverunt P_8 $\overline{EP}\Theta JK\overline{MT}VWZ$
 17, 24: dixerunt] P_8 et codd. praeter $B\Theta K\overline{MT}O^cRVWX^*Z^4$
 (18, 16: adhuc] om. P_8 \overline{MT})
 25, 21: serve bone] P_8 $DEHLOQRW$
 26, 39: Pater] P_8 $AFLR^*X^*?Y$
 26, 56: implerentur] adimpleretur P_8 \overline{MTZ}
 27, 40: templum] P_8 $BCFH\Theta JLMO^*RTX^*Z^*$
 27, 64: surrexit] resurrexit P_8 m. 1 T
Mark: Ch. 1, 12: expellit] expulit P_8 $CDEGH^1\Theta IK\overline{MT}RTVWX^*Z^c$
 1, 36: persecutus] prosecutus P_8 $CDMQR^*VX^c$

⁸⁸ J. Wordsworth and H. J. White, *Novum Testamentum . . . secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi ediderunt* (Oxford, 1889-1922). See the preface of this book for an explanation of the symbols used to designate the various manuscripts. I enclose in parentheses below certain readings, the present importance of which in indicating P_8 's sources I have not yet discovered.

- 3, 11: clamabant] P_8 *codd. praeter* GKV
 4, 35: illa die] in die illa P_8 $\overline{AP}^1\overline{KMT}OVZ$
 5, 16: qui (viderant)] quid P_8 D
 5, 29: corpore] P_8 *codd. praeter* BCGIKTXZ
 (5, 35: ab] ad P_8 m. 1 KW)
 5, 42: obstipuerunt] P_8 ABFGHΘIM \overline{MT} OTVXZ
 6, 17: enim] autem P_8 L
 7, 19: ventrem] +vadit P_8 m. 1 (nunc erasum) $H^{mo}\Theta KTX^*Z$
 8, 6: supra] super P_8 m. 1 $\overline{DEP}\Theta ILQRTVWZ$
 9, 22: si] om. P_8 L
 9, 24: credo] +domine P_8 BFH $\cdot\Theta$ IK \overline{MT} OQTVWXZ
 9, 28: nos] om. P_8 T
 9, 36: ut] cum P_8 BGIK \overline{MT} QVWXZ
 10, 11: dicit] P_8 *codd. praeter* $\overline{KMT}OVZ$
 10, 34: eum *pr.*] om. P_8 m. 1 \overline{KMTRVX}^*Z
 10, 34: eum *sec.*] om. P_8 m. 1 \overline{KMTVXZ}
 10, 35: eum] illum P_8 m. 1 BCKLOTVZ
 10, 40: dare] +vobis P_8 m. 1 BC \overline{DEP} GH $\cdot\Theta$ IKL \overline{MT} OQRTVWX
 11, 31: dicet] +nobis P_8 m. 1 (nunc erasum) BC $\overline{EP}^{mo}\Theta K(L)\overline{MT}$ O
 $QTVX^*Z$
 (12, 31: tamquam] sicut P_8 \overline{EP}^{mo})
 13, 11: duxerint] dixerint P_8 T *
 13, 32: illo] P_8 *codd. praeter* BCK \overline{MT} QTVWXZ
 14, 20: mecum] P_8 m. 2 in ras. manum P_8 m. 1(?) BDKL \overline{MT} O
 $VWXZ^2$
 14, 61: rursum] rursus P_8 RX *
 15, 46: monumento] monumentum P_8 GL
 16, 4: vident] P_8 ABC \overline{DEP}^* FGH \cdot JLMTX \cdot Y
 16, 5: obstipuerunt] P_8 BC \overline{EP} GΘIJM \overline{MT} RTXZ
Praefatio Lucae: p. 270, 10: redire] P_8 *codd. praeter* P_3 Mor
Luke: Ch. 1, 80: deserto] desertis P_8 B \overline{AF} CIJKL \overline{MT} QRTVWZ
 7, 37: ungenti] unguenti P_8 \overline{AF} CDE \overline{EP} GΘIJK \overline{MT} OPQVW
 7, 38: ungento] P_8 m. 1 A \overline{EP}^* HMYZ \cdot
 7, 38: ungebat] unguebat P_8 \overline{AF} CDEGΘIJ \overline{MT} OWZ *
 8, 14: referunt] P_8 *codd. praeter* GK \overline{MT} VED (refferunt)
 8, 27: domo] domu P_8 DV
 8, 32: illis] illos P_8 m. 1 B \overline{AF} DE (illos $\cdot i \cdot$)G * H * ΘJKQVXZ
 9, 18: erant] +autem P_8 G
 9, 24: illam] eam P_8 m. 1 DEGRX * (corr.)
 9, 50: adversus] adversum P_8 *codd. praeter* ADGHMY
 9, 59: et] om. P_8 m. 1 BCGH $\cdot\Theta$ KM \overline{MT} TVZ

- 10, 7: domo *pr.*] domu $P_8 H$ (*ut videtur sed dubium*) \overline{MTV}
 10, 7: domo *sec.*] domu $P_8 \overline{DMTQRV}$
 10, 22: patre] $P_8 \overline{AD\overline{EPGH}^*JMPQY}$
 11, 18: me] *om.* $P_8 m. 1 \overline{BFDO}$
 11, 31: salomone] P_8 *codd. praeter* $\overline{DR\overline{EPGMZ}^*HE\overline{\theta PTW}\overline{MTZ}^*}$
 11, 43: quia] qui $P_8 m. 1 \overline{ADE\overline{EP}^{m_0}H\overline{\theta KMT}OQVWXYZ}$
 11, 52: quia] qui $P_8 \overline{DMTQRVWZ}$
 12, 8: in me] *om.* $P_8 E$
 12, 23: (corpus) quam] plus quam $P_8 m. 1 ER$
 12, 41: ei] *om.* $P_8 m. 1 \overline{BFCE\overline{PGHRTVX}^*}$
 12, 58: apud] ad $P_8 \overline{KOVX}^*Z$
 13, 25: et (incipietis)] *om.* $P_8 m. 1 \overline{BE\overline{EPJKM}\overline{MTOVWX}^*Z}$
 14, 12: reinvitent] invitent $P_8 m. 1 \overline{BFDRZ}$
 14, 26: meus discipulus esse] meus esse discipulus $P_8 \overline{AE\overline{EPG\theta I\overline{MT}}QRWXY}$
 14, 27: *om. versum* $P_8 m. 1 G$
 16, 1: et *pr.*] $P_8 m. 1 \overline{D\overline{EPK}VW}$
 16, 9: vobis dico] dico vobis $P_8 \overline{BF\overline{E\overline{EP}\theta KOQVZ}}$
 16, 10: maiori *bis*] P_8 *codd. praeter* $\overline{CIK\overline{MTT}Z}$
 17, 3: egerit] agerit $P_8 Z$
 17, 33: salvam facere] salvare $P_8 \overline{DJKQVZ}$
 18, 18: faciens] faciam $P_8 m. 1 D$ (*in error*)
 18, 33: die tertia] tertia die $P_8 \overline{DEJKR}$
 20, 14: ut] et $P_8 \overline{EPJKRVZ}$
 20, 34: nubunt] nubent $P_8 m. 1 \overline{EFXZ}$
 21, 9: audieritis] videritis $P_8 D$
 21, 9: non] nondum $P_8 G$
 22, 49: in] *om.* $P_8 \overline{EKT V}$
 22, 60: cantavit gallus] P_8 *codd. praeter* $\overline{BF\overline{E\overline{EP}KOVWX}^*Z}$
 (23, 12: in] ex $P_8 \overline{KV}$)
 23, 14: et] *om.* $P_8 \overline{JKVY}^*(+mg)Z$
 23, 34: faciunt] faciant $P_8 \overline{VZ}$
 23, 38: inscripta] P_8 *codd. praeter* $\overline{BF\overline{EGO}^*X^cYZ^*CO^{rec}TVO^cX^*Z^c}$
 23, 56: ungenta] unguenta $P_8 \overline{BF\overline{DE\overline{EPG\theta IJKQRTVWZ}^*}}$
 24, 20: tradiderunt eum] eum tradiderunt $P_8 \overline{BCD\overline{EP\theta JKOQRTVWX}^*Z}$
 24, 28: ipse finxit] P_8 *codd. praeter* $\overline{EP\overline{R}^*A^2B\overline{BF\overline{C\theta IJKQTVWXZ}}}$

John: Ch. 1, 21: et *sec.*] P_8 *codd. praeter* $\overline{KVZMorP_3}$

1, 29: videt] vidit $P_8 \overline{DEH\overline{\theta JKMTQRTVW}}$

3, 32: accipit] accepit $P_8 \overline{DEH}$

- 4, 9: illa] *om.* P_8 $KRVZ$
 4, 10: donum] domum P_8 R (*et gl. sax. hus*) Y^* (*sed corr.*)
 4, 38: laborem] P_8 $A\Delta\overline{EPFGH}^*MOQRSXY$
 4, 46: et] *om.* P_8 E
 6, 13: superfuerunt] superaverunt P_8 Q^*
 6, 21: accipere eum in navem] P_8 $ACIJ$ (navim) \overline{MTS}
 6, 36: et *pr.*] *om.* P_8 $D\overline{MT}$
 6, 53: habetis] habebitis P_8 *codd. praeter* H^*QZ^*
 7, 6: est] P_8 *codd. praeter* $\overline{FFKMTQVX}^cZ^2$
 7, 8: ascendo] ascendam P_8 $\overline{FFKOTWXZ}$
 8, 27: dicebat] +deum P_8 $CFK\overline{MTO}^c(a\bar{d} \overline{dm} \text{ m. rec.}) T$
 10, 5: sequentur] P_8 $A\Delta FGH\overline{MSY}$
 11, 9: horae sunt] sunt horae P_8 VZ
 11, 13: dormitione] dormitatione P_8 DSX^c
 11, 56: veniat] P_8 $A\overline{FF}\Delta E\overline{EP}^*FGH\overline{\Theta JOQXYZ}$
 12, 8: habetis *pr.*] habebitis P_8 $BCD\Delta EKO^cQRTX^*Z^2$
 12, 19: ergo] autem P_8 $\overline{EP}^{m_0}JQR$
 13, 14: pedes vestros] vestros pedes P_8 $B\overline{FF}CJK\overline{MTOZ}$
 14, 10: credis] creditis P_8 $AC\Delta SY$
 15, 25: me habuerunt] habuerunt me P_8 $DE\overline{EP}^{m_0}QWZ^c$
 15, 27: perhibetis] perhibebitis P_8 $CEH\overline{\Theta JKTW}$
 16, 23: rogabitis] interrogabitis P_8 $B\overline{FFD}\overline{EPKMT}O(-vitis)RVWX^*$
 (*ut videtur*) Z
 17, 22: illis] P_8 $A\overline{FF}^2\Delta E\overline{EP}^*FH\overline{\Theta MRSXY}$
 17, 23: et *quart.*] *om.* P_8 B^*CTZ^*
 18, 36: mundo hoc] P_8 $A\overline{FF}\Delta FGH\overline{\Theta MRSY}$
 18, 39: vobis *pr.*] P_8 *codd. praeter* $DGK\overline{MTVZ}^c$
 20, 13: illi] *om.* P_8 $D\overline{MT}$
 20, 15: tu] *om.* P_8 D
 21, 6: iam] P_8 *codd. praeter* TZP_3Mor
 21, 23: si sic] sic P_8 $AB\overline{FF}CDE\overline{EPFH}\overline{\Theta IKMT}RSTWXY$

The findings concerning P_8 's 'independent' readings may be summed up as follows. P_8 agrees with the Irish group (D , E , L , Q ,⁸⁹ R ,⁸⁹ Z) in the vast majority of instances, particularly

⁸⁹ Rand, 'Alcuin's Bible,' p. 383, names only D , E , L , Z as the Irish group. Wordsworth and White, *op. cit.*, p. x, include Q and R . P_8 , however, agrees with Q and R alone of the Irish group (or with Q or R alone) in the following cases only: Mark, 14, 61 (RX^* , an easy independent change); Luke, 12, 41 ($HCTR$, etc., possibly an independent omission); John, 4, 10 (Y^*R , an easy independent error); John, 4, 38 ($AYHQR$, etc.; harder to explain, but this part of L is not extant); and John, 18, 36 ($AY\overline{\Theta HR}$, etc.; this part of L is not extant).

with *Z* (50 times).⁹⁰ It agrees with *T* alone four times,⁹¹ but in every case there might be some other explanation for the apparent agreement. Again, it appears to agree with *G* alone twice, but these instances too are perhaps not real ones.⁹² *P*₈ sometimes agrees with *ΘH*, the Theodulfian group, (or with *Θ* or *H*) but never without also agreeing with *AY*, the Northumbrian group, (or either *A* or *Y*).⁹³ On the other hand, *P*₈ twice agrees with *AY* (or one of the two) without also agreeing with *ΘH* (or one of the two).⁹⁴ The Theodulfian group can, then, hardly be one of the possible sources for *P*₈'s readings, but the Northumbrian group may be. Moreover, *P*₈ agrees with *CT* of the Spanish group⁹⁵ (or one of the two), but in two of these instances⁹⁶ *P*₈ agrees as well with one or both members of the Northumbrian group and in the third⁹⁷ we are probably dealing with an independent gloss. We may conclude, finally, that *P*₈ secures its 'independent' readings for the most part from the Irish group, and, in a few cases perhaps, from the Northumbrian group.

With this further evidence before us, and with the evidence of the capitula and the divisions previously discussed,⁹⁸ we may now draw a fairly definite picture of the genealogy of *P*₈, a picture not necessarily correct in all its details but certainly correct in its essentials.

⁹⁰ *Z* is frequently the only manuscript which agrees with both *Mor* and *P*₈. *Z* is not the immediate archetype of *P*₈, but it is certainly not far removed in relationship. In addition to the 50 instances mentioned above one should also consider the following instances in which *Z*^c may possibly be *Z m. 1*: Mark, 1, 12; Luke, 7, 38; 11, 31; 23, 38; John, 15, 25; 18, 39.

⁹¹ Matthew, 13, 15 (perhaps independent omission of *enim*); 27, 64 (possibly independent changes); Mark, 9, 28 (perhaps independent omission of *nos*); 13, 11 (perhaps independent changes).

⁹² Luke, 9, 18 (not a bold addition; cf. *autem* in verses 13, 14, and 16, which immediately precede); 21, 9 (possibly independent errors).

⁹³ Epist. ad Damasum, p. 2, 18 (*AHΘKVY*); Matthew, 8, 20 (*ACHΘKM̄MT VWX^c* [*in ras.*] *Y*); Luke, 7, 38 (*AEP*HMXYZ^c*; possibly *Z^c* here = *Z m. 1*); John, 10, 5 (*AΔFGHΘMSY*); cf. Luke, 10, 7 (*H[ut videtur sed dubium] M̄TV*).

⁹⁴ John, 6, 21 (*ACIJM̄TS*); 14, 10 (*ACΔSY*).

⁹⁵ According to Wordsworth and White, *op. cit.*, *T* is *saec. x* and *C saec. ix*. *T*, then, is certainly, and *C* quite possibly, later than *P*₈, but both are nevertheless useful examples of what may have been contained in their models.

⁹⁶ John 6, 21 (*ACIJM̄TS*); 14, 10 (*ACΔSY*).

⁹⁷ John, 8, 27 (*CFKM̄TO* aī dīm *m. rec. T*).

⁹⁸ Pp. 145–149 above.

It was natural, when the Alcuinian revision of the Bible was made, not merely to make new copies of it, but also to revise some of the Bibles then present at Tours. We may start, then, with a Bible at Tours, not necessarily written there, pre-Alcuinian in text and perhaps containing Northumbrian 'divisions.' Into this Bible the Alcuinian readings were entered as variants in the margins and between the lines (let us call the revised manuscript I^{at}), but the Alcuinian capitula were not entered. Capitula after all were an unnecessary luxury. It would perhaps have been difficult to change the existing capitula (since there might have been far greater differences in the capitula than in the text), and it would have been still more difficult to supply folios for Alcuinian capitula in the proper places if no capitula at all had existed to begin with.

At some later time, when a complete A. T. Bible (with proper capitula and chapter divisions in the text) was temporarily unavailable, at least to a particular scribe (perhaps because other scribes were using the available copies),⁹⁹ or when it had been forgotten (this is less likely) that I^{at} was not a *complete* representative of A. T., a student of the text copied I^{at}, adopting most of the Alcuinian variants but still retaining certain pre-Alcuinian readings (particularly Irish and possibly a few Northumbrian). He did not have any capitula, however, perhaps because I^{at} had a set (Northumbrian) *different* from those of A. T. It is possible that he intended to get a proper set from some other source, but his good intentions never saw fulfillment. Let us call this copy II.

Still later, after N. E. had been introduced, another scribe added the readings of N. E. between the lines and in the margins as variants. Let us call this stage II^{ne}.

Next, another student of the text copied II^{ne}. Since he was conservative,¹⁰⁰ he adopted some, but not all, of the N. E.

⁹⁹ Although apparently many Bibles were copied at Tours, they were usually sent to other monasteries for use there. Consequently, at any given time there would not normally have been a large number of Bibles at Tours.

¹⁰⁰ C. H. Beeson, in his review of L. W. Jones and C. R. Morey, *The Miniatures of the Manuscripts of Terence prior to the Thirteenth Century*, II. The Text (Princeton University Press, 1932), in *Classical Philology*, XXIX (1934), 75, states that when new editions of Classical authors were made in the Middle Ages, they immediately drove out

readings. Moreover, perhaps because he noted that the 'divisions' in the text were wholly different from those in N. E., he decided not to disturb them and not to add a set of N. E. capitula from some other source. This final copy is our manuscript *P*₈.

Still later, *m. 2* changed many more non-N. E. readings to N. E. This completes our account.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Before proceeding to our general conclusion concerning the 'logical' theory of the development of the art of Tours let us consider the light thrown incidentally by our discoveries upon two points important for the history of the text of the Bible at Tours. The first point concerns the nature of Alcuin's own text (A. T.).

A. *The Nature of the Alcuinian Text.* Rand has stated¹⁰¹ that there are certain readings in the books of Tours which are not found in any other important group — that is, the Irish (*DELQRZ*),¹⁰² the Northumbrian (*AY*), or the Theodulfian (*ΘH*) — and that these readings were therefore possibly introduced by Alcuin himself, i.e., invented by him or at least adopted by him from some sources now unidentified (the important point is that they represent his choices). To Rand's list of five¹⁰³ such readings I add below thirty-one more. In each case I give the readings of *Mor* and of *P*₈, which always agree, as well as those of *P*₃ and of certain other contrasting manuscripts cited by Wordsworth and White in their larger edition.¹⁰⁴

the older editions. 'When an old codex was copied, the copy displaced the original.' But this is apparently not true of the editions of the *Bible* in every case. The difference is no doubt due to the fact that many of the faithful considered particular editions of the Bible as possessing some sanctity and therefore hesitated to discard them completely.

¹⁰¹ 'Alcuin's Bible,' p. 385.

¹⁰² I add *Q* and *R* to this group in accordance with Wordsworth and White, *op. cit.*, p. x, though Rand does not include them.

¹⁰³ 'Alcuin's Bible,' pp. 383-385. Rand cites seven, but his nos. 5 and 83 are not really examples of his point.

¹⁰⁴ *Op. cit.*

Matthew: Ch. 15, 35: omnes] *codd. P₃ om. MT Mor P₈*

18, 9: †unoculum†] cum uno oculo *E^{cor}EPJKOVXZ^{cor}MT Mor P₈*
(cum unum oculum Z*) — a very much confused passage with varied readings

27, 6: corbanan] *codd. plurimi P₃ P₈ m. 2 corbonan Mor P₈ m. 1*

27, 46: lema sabacthani] *AFΘI*J*(uno ductu)MOX*YP₃ lama zap-*
tani KMT(uno ductu)V Mor P₈ m. 1 — cf. the same reading in Mark, 16, 34

Mark: 2, 9: dimittuntur] *codd. plurimi P₃ demittuntur V Mor P₈*

4, 26: homo iaciat] *codd. multi P₃ iaciat homo BKTvZ₃ Mor P₈*
(there are many other readings also)

9, 48: extinguitur] *codd. plurimi P₃ P₈ m. 2 extinguetur KMTTV*
Mor P₈ m. 1

11, 25: et (Pater)] *codd. plurimi P₃ P₈ m. 2 inter lineas G om. KV*
Mor P₈ m. 1

Argumentum Lucae: p. 270, 4: praesumta, cui evangelium] *codd.*
plurimi P₃ om. Mor P₈ (independent error)

p. 271, 6: demonstrare] *codd. plurimi om. Mor P₈*

Luke: Ch. 2, 12: praesepio] *codd. plurimi P₃ P₈ m. 2 presepe KV*
cor. vat. praesepe FZ p̄sepe Mor P₈ m. 1 — cf. the same reading in Ch. 2, 16.

2, 42: in] *codd. plures P₃ P₈ m. 2 om. GKMTVW Mor P₈ m. 1*

3, 28: Helmadam] *codd. plurimi P₃ helmodam O^cV aur. Mor P₈*
elmodam KW — and other readings

7, 32: tibiis] *codd. plurimi P₃ P₈ m. 2 om. GKMTW abcdff²lqrδ*
Mor P₈ m. 1

7, 39: dicens] *codd. plurimi P₃ om. Mor P₈*

8, 1: civitatem et castellum] *codd. plurimi P₃ civitates et castella*
GKMTQVWvg. bcef ff²lq aur. Mor. P₈ m. 1 civitates & castellū
P₈ m. 2

8, 12: sunt] +hii (P₈ hi) sunt *Mor P₈*

9, 6: per] *codd. plurimi P₃ P₈ m. 2 om. KMTV Mor P₈ m. 1*

11, 4: dimittimus] *codd. plurimi P₃ P₈ m. 2 demittimus MT¹ V*
Mor P₈ m. 1

14, 31: non] *codd. plurimi P₃ nonne KWadf ff²irδ Mor P₈*

19, 22: sum] *codd. plurimi P₃ P₈ m. 2 sim KO^cXZ² Mor P₈ m. 1*

20, 35: nubunt . . . ducunt] *codd. plurimi P₃ P₈ m. 2 nubent . . .*
ducent KVV Mor P₈ m. 1 q cod. ' ' ap. cor. vat. nubent . . .
*ducunt E*FZ nubunt . . . ducent MT*

22, 10: domum] *codd. plurimi P₃ P₈ m. 2 domo FKV Mor P₈ m. 1*

- Explicit Evangelium secundum Lucam] *codd. plurimi* +vers.
 III DCCC KV *Mor P₈* (Explicuit . . .)+habet vers̄ Num̄
 III DCCC *P₃*
- John*: Ch. 1, 12: receperunt eum] *codd. plurimi P₃* eū receperunt
Mor P₈
- 6, 37: eiciam] *codd. plurimi P₃* eieciā \overline{EP} *Mor P₈* ieciā $D\Delta R$
 eciā \overline{MTO} eiiciā *vg. Tisch* abiciā *d* eicio ff^2 *aur.* — and
 other readings
- 12, 12: audissent] *codd. plurimi P₃* audiissent *D* audisset \overline{FKZ}^c
Mor P₈ vidissent \overline{MT}
- 12, 22: Andreae] *codd. plurimi P₃* +et *V Mor P₈*
- 13, 10: indiget ut lavet] *codd. plurimi P₃ m. 1* +nisi ut pedes lavet
 (Iabet *O^c T*) $ACIM\overline{TO}^c TVWX^c$ *vg. Tisch b ff^2 lm Ambr.* +nisi
 pedes ut lavet *Mor P₃ m. 2 P₈* — and other readings
- 16, 2: venit] *codd. plurimi P₃* veniet $GKV\text{ceflqr}$ *Cypr. bis (ad Fort.*
11, Ep. 58. 2) Mor P₈
- 21, 1: iterum Iesus] *codd. plurimi P₃* Iesus iterum *K cum gr. 19.*
69. 435 Mor P₈

This does not exhaust the evidence. It makes clear, I believe, the fact that Alcuin (or at least the editor, if Alcuin was not responsible) introduced certain readings representing his inventions or choices from previous sources into his famous edition of the Bible (A. T.).

B. *The Date of the New Edition (N. E.).* The second point may be stated more briefly. At some time within a generation after the Alcuinian recension (A. T.) of the Bible there occurred the thoroughgoing revision known as the New Edition (N. E.). The exact date of N. E., however, is a matter of dispute. Köhler puts it in the régime of Adalhardus (834–843), and feels that the compiler is none other than Amalricus,¹⁰⁵ one of the three magistri in 841,¹⁰⁶ who caused an improvement in the school's work by a gift to it in that year. Rand, on the other hand, states his opinion that N. E. was achieved in the régime of Fridugisus (807–834).¹⁰⁷ What is the testimony of *P₈* with its

¹⁰⁵ Köhler at first asks (Schule, p. 342) if it is too bold a conjecture to regard Amalricus as the compiler of N. E. and then speaks positively of the 'Amalricustext' and the 'Amalricusrevision' (*loc. cit.*).

¹⁰⁶ Schule, p. 22.

¹⁰⁷ 'Alcuin's Bible,' p. 393.

N. E. text and its early style of illustration? P_8 (and consequently N. E.) is either earlier than the date of Amalricus' gift (841) or its illustrations are fifty years later than they seem. That the second alternative is extremely unlikely is demonstrated by P_8 's ruling (O. S. as far as examined),¹⁰⁸ script,¹⁰⁹ and abbreviations.¹¹⁰ N. E., then, is probably ten or fifteen years earlier than the latter part of the régime of Adalhardus (834-843), though some of its illustrations are archaic even for this period.¹¹¹ The whole matter deserves further investigation, an investigation which can be materially aided by further complete collations of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John in the Bibles and Gospels of Tours.¹¹²

C. *The Necessity of Changing the 'Logical' Theory of the Development of Art at Tours.* It must now be obvious to the reader that P_8 is to be placed at some point (perhaps at the middle) in the régime of Fridugisus (807-834). It is not, as Nordenfalk holds,¹¹³ a pre-Alcuinian book. It cannot, therefore, be used as a model for either text or art at Tours before Alcuin's residence there. On the contrary, it is an excellent example of the fact that the development of the illumination at Tours is not entirely a record of orderly progress. What seemed to Nordenfalk¹¹⁴ a 'natural' development in art from the Codex Aureus to P_8 and then to the St. Gall Bible must now be explained in some other way. Since I am not an expert in the history of art, I prefer to wait for a detailed explanation from some other investigator, but I strongly suspect that P_8 secured whatever archaic qualities its illustrations possess through fairly strict adherence to its model.

The question does not stop here, however. Nordenfalk's conjecture concerning P_8 is but a single manifestation of the

¹⁰⁸ The Earliest Book of Tours, p. 96.

¹⁰⁹ *Loc. cit.*

¹¹⁰ *Loc. cit.* The Regular set, in general. Note $\ddot{\text{t}}$ always for -tur.

¹¹¹ This is probably due to fairly strict adherence to an older model.

¹¹² The added variants in *London, British Museum, Add. 11848* and in the Gospels of Nancy should also be examined in this connection to see if they are by the original scribe or by a later hand. Cf. 'Alcuin's Bible,' p. 395.

¹¹³ See above, p. 140.

¹¹⁴ 'Methodische Fortschritte und Materieller Landerwerb in der Kunstforschung,' in *Acta Archaeologica*, III (1932), p. 284 and Abb. 2, p. 283. Cf. also pp. 282-283.

general theory of Köhler, the theory of an intricately logical progress in the art of Tours. In view of the nature of P_8 , as well as that of certain other manuscripts of Tours,¹¹⁵ this theory must now be amended in many important details. If we admit with Köhler that the art of Tours rises from humble beginnings before Alcuin's time to a high point at the mid-century, we must also admit (much more than Köhler does) that the development is uneven. This is of course the case with the script.¹¹⁶ Here and there an illuminator copies, with blind subservience or with little change, the illumination he sees before him. At the same time the scribe (who is occasionally at least the illuminator) may employ the script current at the moment. In this way a phenomenon such as P_8 (with the art apparently older than the script) may come about. A further unevenness or illogicality in the development is bound to result from the differences in skill and inventive power of the various illuminators. The whole history of the illumination at Tours must be rewritten with much ampler consideration for possibilities of this sort than Köhler has yet shown.

I append below a list of those illuminated¹¹⁷ manuscripts of Tours concerning which Köhler¹¹⁸ (= K) and Rand¹¹⁹ (= R) seriously disagree, together with certain opinions and suggestions of my own. If Köhler's theory be amended, we may then — and not until then — arrive at the ultimate disposition of these books. The list follows:¹²⁰

Alcuin (796–804)¹²¹

1. St. Gall 75 (No. 33. IVa. Not lately or adequately examined by R).
2. St. Gall 268 (No. 232. Rejected by R as a book of Tours).

¹¹⁵ See above, pp. 141 ff. *passim*.

¹¹⁶ See above, pp. 136–137.

¹¹⁷ Of course Köhler does not agree with Rand concerning a number of non-illuminated manuscripts as well (G. G. A., pp. 323–327), but our present concern is with illumination.

¹¹⁸ G. G. A., pp. 323–332.

¹¹⁹ G. G. A., pp. 340–347; 'Alcuin's Bible,' pp. 327–335; elsewhere when noted.

¹²⁰ The Arabic numerals at the left of the items are Köhler's. Rand's designations are in parentheses.

¹²¹ To this list should be added *Cologne, Dombibliothek XIII*, thought once by Köhler (Survey, p. 115) a product of St. Martin's early in Alcuin's time, but later ex-

3. Paris, B. N., lat. 4333B (No. 19. III. Just before or soon after the Reform: R).
5. London, British Museum, Harley 2790 (No. 27. Perhaps about 820: R).
7. London, British Museum, Harley 2793 (No. 28. IVa. About the same date as Harley 2790: R).

Fridugisus (807-834)¹²²

15. Basel A. N. I. 3 (No. 95. Earlier than Period V. Turonizing: R; cf. R in *The Earliest Book of Tours*, pp. 95-110).
24. The Hague, Museum Meermanno-Westreenianum Q. 5 (No. 98. V. Turonizing: R).

Adalhardus (834-843)¹²³

32. Paris, B. N., lat. 10848 (No. 56. IVb. Nearer 816 than 835: R).
34. Bamberg A. 1, 5 (No. 47. IVb. 'Not done in Alcuin's lifetime. . . . Perhaps not too long after his death . . .': R).
35. Vienna 468 (No. 104. V: R. See Jones in *The Earliest Book of Tours*, pp. 114-115: Period V but earlier than K).

Vivian (843-851).

39. Bamberg H. J. IV. 12 (No. 71. V. After 832, but close to it: R).
45. Chartres 24 (No. 74. V. 820-830: R).
46. Rome, Vat. Urb. 1146 (No. 90. V).

cluded from his list (G. G. A., p. 325), although with hesitation. This book I (Jones) find in *The Earliest Book of Tours*, pp. 92-94, to be Alcuinian (IVa).

¹²² There are minor disagreements in this period in manuscripts not mentioned below. See G. G. A., pp. 341-342 on Nos. 12, 13, 14, 16, 21, 25, and 26. On No. 25 (No. 48-R) and on No. 16 (No. 63-R) see also *The Earliest Book of Tours*, p. 95 (Jones) and pp. 96-100 (Rand) respectively.

¹²³ In general, Rand puts *all* the books in this group of Köhler's nearer 820 than 843. The remaining members of the group are: 27. Paris, B. N., lat. 3 (No. 80. V); 28. Nancy, the Gospels of St. Gozlin (No. 79. V); 29. Paris, B. N., lat. 274 (No. 82. V); 30. Wolfenbüttel 2186 (No. 128. VI); 31. London, British Museum, Add. 10546 (No. 77. V); 33. Basel B. II. 11 (No. 96. V. Cf. Rand in *The Earliest Book of Tours*, pp. 110-112); 35. Vienna 468 (No. 104. V); 36. Leningrad Q. V. 1. No. 21 (No. 102. V).

The Second Half of the Century (after 853)¹²⁴

- 47. London, Beatty 8 (No. 115. VI).
- 48. Dijon, Archives Générales, Fragment of the Gospel of St. Matthew (No. 109. VI).
- 50. Paris, B. N., lat. 263 (No. 118. VI).
- 51. Paris, B. N., lat. 47 (No. 117. VI).
- 56. Berlin 115. Philipp. 1877 (No. 108. VI).
- 57. Paris, B. N., lat. 5582 (No. 120. VI).¹²⁵

All of these books should be given further study with an amended theory of illumination in mind. In the case of the Bibles and Gospels (not merely those listed above, but all of those written at Tours) investigators should make fuller collations of the text in the hope of obtaining more exact evidence of date. For this purpose, I hope, the apparatus presented in this discussion will be useful.

¹²⁴ Note Rand's statement, *G. G. A.*, p. 346: 'Some of the books in the present section, therefore, that I have labelled Period VI might well have been done after the sacking of St. Martin's — my approximate limit was 860.'

¹²⁵ To the present group should be added Berlin, Preuss. Staatsbib., Hamilton 248 (No. 124: R). See Jones in *The Earliest Book of Tours*, pp. 115-117.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- ONE LIGHT BURNING. A Romantic Story. *By R. C. Hutchinson.* New York, Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1935. 340 p. 2. 50 Dollars.
- THE ILLUSION OF IMMORTALITY. *By Corliss Lamont.* New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1935. x, 294 p. 3 Dollars.
- THE RECEPTION OF THE EGYPTIAN CULTS BY THE GREEKS (330-30 B.C.). *By Thomas Allan Brady.* The University of Missouri Studies, Vol. X. No. 1, Jan. 1935. 88 p. 1.25 Dollars.
- L'IRRÉDUCTIBILITÉ DE LA MORALE À LA SCIENCE DES MOEURS. *Par Constantin C. Pavel.* Bucarest, Jean C. Văcărescu, 1935. 144 p. 8 Francs.
- RELIGIOUS BELIEF AND CHARACTER AMONG JEWISH ADOLESCENTS. *By Abraham N. Franzblau.* Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 634. New York, Teachers College, 1934. viii, 80 p. 1.50 Dollars.
- ARCHIVUM FRATRUM PRAEDICATORUM III. 1933. Paris, R. Haloua, 1933. 300 p. 60 Francs.
- ARCHIVUM FRATRUM PRAEDICATORUM IV. 1934. Romae. 322 p.
- SVENSKA KYRKAN OCH DE PROTESTANTISKA ENHETSSTRÄVANDENA UNDER 1630-TALET. *Av Gunnar Westin.* Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1934 Teologi U. Uppsala, A.-B. Lundequist, 1934. 332 p. 10 Kroner.
- RE-THINKING RELIGIOUS LIBERALISM. *By Rufus M. Jones.* The Fourth Unification Address on the Arthur Emmons Pearson Foundation. Boston, The Beacon Press, 1935. iii, 26 p. 1 Dollar.
- MORALS AND POLITICS; Theories of their Relation from Hobbes and Spinoza to Marx and Bosanquet. *By E. F. Carritt.* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1935. 216 p. 2.25 Dollars.
- THE WAY OF SIMPLICITY: A Guide for the Perplexed. *By W. E. Orchard.* New York, E. P. Dutton, 1935. vii, 321 p. 2 Dollars.
- BIBLE MARIALE et Mariologie de Saint Albert-le-Grand. *Par Marie-Albert Genevois.* Saint-Maximin, 1934. 199 p. 30 Francs.
- A MANUAL OF EXCAVATION IN THE NEAR EAST; Methods of Digging and Recording of the Tell en-Nasbedh Expedition in Palestine. *By William Frederic Bade.* Berkeley, University of California Press, 1934. vii, 81 p. 1.50 Dollars.
- THE REDISCOVERY OF JOHN WESLEY. *By George Croft Cell.* New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1935. xvi, 420 p. 2.50 Dollars.

PUBLISHER'S STATEMENT OF CIRCULATION. — This is to certify that the average circulation per issue of the Harvard Theological Review for the six months period July 1st to and including December 31st, 1934, was as follows: Copies sold, 240; copies distributed free, 160; total, 400.

Signed: David T. Pottinger, for the Harvard University Press, Publishers.

Subscribed and sworn before me on this 15th day of April, 1935; Joseph Barresi,
Notary Public.